

Detroit City Planning Commission  
Special Meeting  
2 Woodward, 13th Floor  
Detroit, Michigan  
Thursday, April 14, 2005  
4:00 P.M.

---

**APPEARANCES:**

For the Planning  
Commission:

ARTHUR SIMONS  
DR. DAVID CASON, JR.  
ROBERT L. GLENN  
KATHLEEN WENDLER  
ANTHONY JEFFREY  
SUSAN GLASER  
THOMAS CHRISTENSEN  
MARSHA BRUHN

MARCUS LOPER  
HEIDI ALCOCK  
CHRIS GULOCK  
KIMBERLY JAMES  
JAMES RIBBRON  
DEBORAH FERRIS  
JANICE TILLMAN

**RECORDED BY:**

REGENCY COURT REPORTING  
3133 Union Lake Road, Ste. A  
Commerce Twp., MI 48382  
(248) 360-2145

MR. SIMONS: The Special Meeting of the City -- of the City Planning Commission is now called to order. The date is April 14th, 2005. May we have a roll call.

MS. BRUHN: Commissioner Cason. (No verbal response)

MS. BRUHN: Commissioner Christensen.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Here.

MS. BRUHN: Commissioner Glaser.

MS. GLASER: Here.

MS. BRUHN: Commissioner Glenn. (No verbal response)

MR. SIMONS: He's here.

MS. BRUHN: We'll have to --

MR. SIMONS: Cason is here.

MS. BRUHN: No, I'll have to wait until they come. Commissioner Jeffrey.

MR. JEFFREY: Here.

MS. BRUHN: Commissioner Simons.

MR. SIMONS: Here.

MS. BRUHN: Commissioner Smith will not be here. Commissioner Wendler.

MS. WENDLER: Here.

MS. BRUHN: Commissioner Williams is out of town, he will not be here, but you do have a quorum present, Mr. Chair.

MR. SIMONS: Thank you. Thank you, Marsha. Are there any changes to the Agenda?

MS. BRUHN: Mr. Chairman, staff would request that you reverse

the items under Roman Numeral IV, Old Business, and take Item B of the Neighborhood Opportunity Fund recommendations and put it in first --

MR. SIMONS: Okay.

MS. BRUHN: -- followed by the Block Grant.

MR. SIMONS: Okay, I understand it as approval as to changes. Approval of the Minutes, a Special Meeting of March 31st, 2005. Can I get a motion to approve?

DR. CASON: Move.

MS. WENDLER: So moved.

MR. SIMONS: All in favor?

ALL: Aye.

MR. SIMONS: Okay, approved. Now we're ready for Item, Old Business, the one with -- you don't want grants first. And I guess we have all the people here involved with --

MS. BRUHN: The staff is here, yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SIMONS: Staff is here. Come to the table, if you will.

MS. BRUHN: And I do have additional Conflict of Interest Forms if anybody needs to --

MR. JEFFREY: Other than the ones we already seen?

MS. BRUHN: We have yours, Commissioner Jeffrey.

MR. JEFFREY: Okay.

MS. BRUHN: And Commissioner Wendler's, and Commissioner Glaser's.

MR. JEFFREY: We're not voting this tonight, right?

MS. BRUHN: Yes, you are.

MR. JEFFREY: On Block Grant?

MS. BRUHN: Block Grant and NOF. City Council -- if I could through the Chair?

MR. SIMONS: Sure.

MS. BRUHN: City Council will be starting NOF, the Block Grant on Monday.

MR. JEFFREY: On the --

MR. SIMONS: Sure, go ahead.

MR. JEFFREY: On the -- on the new chart, can we go through the changes there, the Block Grants, since we may not have -- how are we doing that? Never mind, never mind. Well, don't mean to interrupt you. Are we ready to start?

MR. SIMONS: Yeah.

MR. JEFFREY: I was looking at some of the groups that were left out, and there were a number of groups that were not funded and the record reason was, at the end, cost analysis, they said that it was because of our priorities. But as I went through them, I saw that several of them were -- fit the criteria that we had identified and probably should not have been zeroed out based on that criteria. And, so the only change, or improvement on what CRC did, which I think they did an excellent job --

MR. SIMONS: They did an excellent job.

MR. JEFFREY: -- but I just want to see some of these groups that were left out, what we can -- or if there is anything we can do across the board to put them back in, without going through them individually. I have one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten -- at least ten.

MR. SIMONS: I guess I'll ask Deborah, if you could -- Deborah, you want to give us an overview of how much money is left, and how we have done so far, and if there's money left after we switch it around?

MS. FERRIS: Okay, I'm going to let Ms. Alcock do the totals.

MR. SIMONS: Okay.

MS. FERRIS: Because she's got them in front of her, and I don't have a computer running yet.

MR. SIMONS: Heidi?

MS. ALCOCK: Okay, you do have the new Block Grant chart tonight, which I know we're going to discuss secondly, but the totals I'm about to give you are based on the new Block Grant chart and electronic --

MR. SIMONS: (Inaudible)

MS. ALCOCK: Yes. In all, there is a surplus of 100- -- \$109,000. It's 109,872 to be exact, that's indicated from the last page of your Block Grant chart. The charts that you have before you represent the 20% admin. planning being maxed out, so you're in balance with admin. planning. And it shows that for public service you actually have a surplus of 322,150 -- it's about 322,000, however, you have to weigh that against the fact that you only have, technically, 109,000. So if you choose to spend that 322- in public service, you would have to find about 222,000 somewhere else in the budget to be in balance.

MR. SIMONS: Well, I think what we might do, if the Commissioners agree with me, if you have any changes that you want to make anywhere to this document or anywhere else, just state it now, so we don't have to go through each one of them, we start there first.

MR. GLENN: Mr. Chairman?

MR. SIMONS: Mm-hmm.

MR. GLENN: I would like to just say, to the Commission and the staff, that I will have to agree that the CRC recommendation, I do agree with very much, and I would like to suggest there is not any, other than what the Commissioner yesterday talked about, that we are to accept the recommendations and move forward unless --

MR. SIMONS: I have a couple of changes to be made now.

MR. GLENN: Okay.

MR. SIMONS: So when we finish with all the changes we have to make, we can finish.

MR. GLENN: Okay, thank you.

MR. SIMONS: Anyone else need to make any changes?

MS. BRUHN: Did you get the Minutes?

MR. SIMONS: Hmm?

MS. BRUHN: Did you get the Minutes?

MR. SIMONS: Yeah. We're on page 24, item -- item 240.

MR. GLENN: 240?

MR. SIMONS: Mm-hmm.

MR. GLENN: Damon House?

MR. SIMONS: That's the Damon House. I would like to see that raised from 70,000 to a hundred thousand.

MS. TILLMAN: To a hundred thousand?

MR. SIMONS: Mm-hmm. Anybody else, any others that have any comments?

DR. CASON: Yes, I have, on page 18.

MR. SIMONS: 18?

DR. CASON: 13 -- 18. Apparently there's some sort of discrepancy, if we could discuss this for a moment.

MR. SIMONS: What's the number of that one? Page 18, what number?

DR. CASON: It's 281, I guess.

MR. SIMONS: 281. Okay, go ahead.

DR. CASON: "Ineligible: no documentation that board meets quarterly." And I understand that this -- this was included in the documentation, about the board meeting quarterly.

MR. SIMONS: Heidi, can you make a comment on that, or Deborah?

MS. FERRIS: Well, there is a question in the application that says, "How often does the board meet?" Is that how it's worded? Oh, here it is. "List dates and times of organizations' regular board meetings." There was not an answer, as I understand it, to that question. The agency has provided, today, information that indicates that they do meet quarterly, but -- and we had actually raised this with CRC, and they have been funded other years, so the

presumption is that they were. But CRC was sort of hard and fast about the fact that the information needed to be in the proposal and they shouldn't have to rely on previous applications. You know, that question was there and all they needed to do was answer it. And so that was the decision they made, and I think they -- they followed that procedure pretty consistently throughout their entire review and chose not to fund it.

MR. SIMONS: Not fund because of --

MS. BRUHN: And that's consistent with the -- with the criteria saying that the applications have to be complete.

MR. SIMONS: Have to be complete.

DR. CASON: So the application was incomplete?

MS. BRUHN: It was incomplete because that was not -- are there two questions, I believe?

MS. TILLMAN: Well, the first half of the board question was not answered, so there were like four questions in total that was not answered. The only thing that was supplied was the board address, their name and address, none of the questions were answered.

MR. SIMONS: None of the questions were answered.

MS. TILLMAN: Not related to the board.

MR. SIMONS: Not related to the board, okay. Well, I suppose there's nothing we can do.

DR. CASON: That's the case, I know I have a communication here, which is -- in other words, what is here was not in the application?

MS. BRUHN: Correct. I don't know what you have. If that's what was submitted to our office, it was not in the application.

DR. CASON: Can I just read this, and we can go on?

MR. SIMONS: Sure, go ahead.

MS. BRUHN: Sure.

DR. CASON: This is from Ms. Penny Bailer and it's to the Planning Department: "To Whom It May Concern," it says, "This is to certify that the bylaws in City Year, Inc., a national organization, under (inaudible) 1.C3, we operate in Detroit, specify no limitation on the number of board members for local site (inaudible), however, a range of 20 to 25 is recommended." And it says, "pertinent," says City of Detroit, City Year has 22 active board members elected by the board and two designated corporate representatives, etcetera, etcetera. Now here's the last paragraph that I think that we -- "In addition, our board meets quarterly, in March, June, September and December, and has done so since our founding in 1999. As example, to date, the meetings for the 2004-2005 are documented on the last page of each meeting agenda of the board 2004 meeting, December 2004 meeting attached. The meeting dates are June 15th, 2004, September 17th, 2004, December 8th, 2004, March 9th, 2004, and June 29th, 2005." So this information here, what we're saying was not included in the application.

MS. TILLMAN: Yes.

MR. SIMONS: There was no -- there was no minutes, anything from those board meetings?

MS. TILLMAN: No.

MR. SIMONS: Okay. Do you have a question?

MR. CHRISTENSEN: No, I didn't have a question.

MR. SIMONS: Okay. Now if we can go on to -- to -- I think, Tony, you want to go into the list that we have there?

MR. JEFFREY: Yeah. You know, the fact that these groups were funded and the only reason they were eliminated was because CRC felt -- and I'm not blaming CRC -- they felt that they were following our guidelines and eliminating groups they did not believe would fit with what we felt our proprieties were, and when I went through some of these groups I see that, in my mind, that's not the case. Dominican Literacy is one, Manhood, Safe Center, Detroit Center for Youth, Don Bosco, there's several here that I think are youth-related, that would definitely fit within the priorities that we identified. So I don't know what the cost would be, I think I figured if we took all the ones on this list, which I'm not in favor of, because some of them I think might be



questionable, but there are several that I think pretty clearly fit within the priorities that we established, so I would like for us to put them back in, and we need to find the money without -- I don't want get into going through, as Commissioner Glenn said, each one, but I think that from a status, from an activity standpoint, is there any -- any public service in Block Grant?

MS. ALCOCK: Yeah, there's actually one item, it's for the Human Services Department, there's a program for substance abuse at the Human Services Department that's being shipped into Planning and Development. We just found this out when the Mayor's budget came in this week, and it's for \$80,000. It's not to support any staff, but it's to support the actual services associated with that program, so it's \$80,000 in Block Grant. And the remainder that you have overall, 322- that can be spent -- 322,000 that can be spent in public service, but you will have to take at least 220,000 from some other place.

MR. JEFFREY: 220,000?

MS. ALCOCK: Because you only have 100- of a real surplus overall.

MR. JEFFREY: Okay.

MS. ALCOCK: The other 200- would have to be taken from a non, from some other non-public service item, if you want to add public service by that much.

MR. JEFFREY: So we can take something from a non-public service and add it to public service?

MS. ALCOCK: Right, you can do some tradeoff, but up to 322-.

MR. JEFFREY: Okay. I would -- which leads me to my second point: I thought that one of our priorities was senior home repair, but I thought we had had some discussions, and maybe this year is not the year to do it, but I thought we had had some discussions about any other home repair being more targeted to code enforcement and possibly low interest loans, or something to that nature. It's probably too late to craft a program of that nature, but I would like to recommend that when you put these groups back in, that we take the \$322,000 --

MS. ALCOCK: It would be over, just over 200,000.

MR. JEFFREY: -- from the non-senior home repair programs.

MR. SIMONS: Also, I might add -- go ahead, Marsha.

MS. BRUHN: Well, I just would like -- first of all, JoAnn Jeromin is not here, so Ms. Buckner is here today. For all of us, we would like you to go one by one so we have a proposal number and a name.

MR. JEFFREY: Okay, alright.

MS. BRUHN: And make sure we have a complete --

MR. JEFFREY: I can just name the ones that I'm looking at.

MS. BRUHN: Right.

MR. SIMONS: I'm sorry, Susan, you had a question?

MS. GLASER: I was actually going to ask for your other five, because you only gave us five. And then I was going to ask Heidi, you said that the money was transferred from Planning -- from Human Services to Planning and Development for drug abuse?

MS. ALCOCK: Under the new Mayor's proposed budget cut.

MS. GLASER: Thank you, I just wanted to be clear.

MR. SIMONS: Commissioner Christensen, you had a question?

MR. CHRISTENSEN: No, I just would like to go ahead and ask Commissioner Jeffrey, CRC says it doesn't meet our priorities --

MR. JEFFREY: Right.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: -- why do you think it does meet the priorities?

MR. JEFFREY: Because one of our priorities is youth, and I went through each one of these and many of them do address the issue of youth and -- and I'm not evaluating their effectiveness or all of that. I would assume that if CRC did that and they put them in for funding, the only reason they were taken out was because they felt at the last minute

they had to balance the budget and they felt that these groups did not meet our priorities, and I -- I tend to disagree with them on several of them, I believe that they do. So if there's some funding, some money, and I would also -- Commissioner Simons added another 30,000, so that's going to have to come from somewhere, so I'm recommending that --

MR. SIMONS: I suppose we can go through this list.

MR. JEFFREY: I'm recommending that --

MR. SIMONS: Maybe there are some you have questions with, and I have a question about a couple.

MR. JEFFREY: You know, I don't want to, myself, I don't want to have to go through each one of them. I just take for granted that CRC felt they were valuable organizations and the only reason they eliminated them was because they felt that it didn't -- they didn't meet our priority, and so I'm operating on the assumption that they're valuable programs, that the only reason they didn't get funded was because of that understanding, so I'm saying --

MR. SIMONS: To not be funded, which one would you eliminate?

MR. JEFFREY: I'm saying we treat them all -- well, I'm just going to give you the 10 that I'm concerned about, that I think should be put back in, and I think they should be put back in across the board, and the money comes out of home repair, that's my suggestion.

MR. SIMONS: Is there a question?

MS. FERRIS: Well, just a comment to Mr. Christensen's question. First off, all the groups, you know, that we looked at, in regards to this, were ones that CRC had initially made recommendations to fund.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Right.

MS. FERRIS: They were over budget. One of the things that -- that sort of right across the board got cut out were, because your priorities say youth services, especially tutoring, they looked at programs that were primarily recreational, and those went, because they had to solve a three million dollar problem, so that was in some regards. And some of the other programs that over time the staff has

learned to look at as almost an economic development, like the literacy and some of those, they're public services, but they -- they enable people to get jobs. CRC was not looking at those programs from that perspective, and that may have been because of the way we wrote the description. You know, we talked about literacy and learning to read, and didn't say learning to read to get a job, so those were on the chopping block, too. So I think if you have -- certainly on the ones, we can discuss how we think it does or doesn't fit, if you have a question about that.

MR. SIMONS: Go ahead, name the 10, Tony.

MR. JEFFREY: And actually I looked at the memo from the staff, and so what I'm saying kind of fits with what they said. I think we requested, or asked that staff take a look at these. So let me start again: Dominican Literacy; Manhood.

MS. BRUHN: Okay, now wait.

MR. JEFFREY: Number five.

MR. SIMONS: There are no numbers.

MR. JEFFREY: I have the proposal numbers. Proposal Number 5, Dominican Literacy; Proposal Number 31, Manhood; Proposal Number 74, Safe Center.

MR. SIMONS: Which one now?

MR. JEFFREY: Safe Center.

MR. SIMONS: Safe Center?

MR. JEFFREY: Number 74. Proposal 109, Detroit Center for Youth; Number 126, Don Bosco; 153, Gray and Gray; 204, Think Detroit; 249, Boys and Girls Club; 316, Marygrove, I think that's what that is.

MR. SIMONS: Marygrove. Okay, 316.

MR. JEFFREY: Marygrove. And how many is that?

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Nine.

MR. JEFFREY: And the other one would be -- I said Boys and Girls Club, right? Gray and Gray.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: You said Gray and Gray.

MR. JEFFREY: Oh, okay. A senior moment, hold on one second. I'm a senior. I'm a part of AARP, did I tell you all? Alright, just to make sure. The other one was Masters.

DR. CASON: Which one?

MR. JEFFREY: Masters, 332.

MS. FERRIS: Masters Mission, Greater Grace.

MR. JEFFREY: Yeah, 332. Those were the ones.

DR. CASON: I'm looking at the memo. Are you looking at it?

MR. SIMONS: The memo is also in here.

DR. CASON: Oh, okay. I didn't see the Masters, though --

MR. JEFFREY: Well, I had another list that I was looking at, but --

MS. GLASER: Mr. Chair, there's actually three that aren't on this list: Detroit Center for Youth, Gray and Gray, and Master Mission.

MR. SIMONS: Do you got numbers for those?

MR. JEFFREY: Yeah, I just gave them.

MS. GLASER: He just gave them, I'm just identifying the --

MS. BRUHN: Is there a handout that we --

MR. SIMONS: That's the thing, you gave a handout to all of us, but all of those that they mentioned are not on this handout, unless there's another handout.

MR. JEFFREY: Okay.

MS. BRUHN: We have copies here.

MR. JEFFREY: Okay, so those are groups -- again, let me be clear, those are groups that were reviewed, evaluated, recommended for funding by CRC. They had a three million dollar def. overage, and the only reason those groups were left out was because they had to solve that overage. So I

don't want to have to go back through each one of these myself. I'm trusting that they did a thorough evaluation, and I don't want these groups to be left out because there may have been a strict interpretation of our priorities, and so I think that these are good groups and that they should be put back in.

DR. CASON: But do we have the funding?

MR. JEFFREY: My recommendation is that we take the money from non-senior home repair, and I think we have 330 -- 22,000 in public service; we may not be able to fund them all, but that's my suggestion.

MS. ALCOCK: In response to how this affects the big picture, if all those groups were to be reinstated at 50-, which is the minimum this year, 50,000 would be the minimum agreed upon by Council, it would require that you find \$207,850 in public service somewhere else to be within the 15% public service cap. And that includes the \$30,000 that was already added for Damon's House.

MR. SIMONS: Do we have -- we don't have that much. We don't have that much?

MS. ALCOCK: You would have to find it from other items in here.

MR. SIMONS: Well, I might say this, anyone who gets public -- getting public service this time, that has unspent monies from before, do you have any --

MS. FERRIS: Well, we've actually, just today, got the -- the Contact Status Report, so we may actually have that answer, but we haven't even begun to have the time to get --

MR. SIMONS: I suggest that you look to those groups that have money, have not spent it, and you take it from there first, that's my opinion.

MS. FERRIS: I know there are some, because there were a few contracts that have gone through in the last two weeks --

MR. SIMONS: Right.

MS. FERRIS: -- that took people well into 2006-2007.

DR. CASON: But there's some groups that have not spent money simply because they were not given money right away.

MR. SIMONS: No, they were -- well, they were awarded funds, right.

DR. CASON: They may have been awarded, but they may not have received it.

MR. SIMONS: I don't know, that's what I want to know. Go ahead, Kathy.

MS. WENDLER: I would just ask that staff give us the contract date when we look at those issues.

MR. JEFFREY: We're not going to have --

MS. WENDLER: Not now, not now.

MR. SIMONS: Right, okay.

MR. JEFFREY: We have to vote tonight, though.

MS. WENDLER: Right, right. Question, if I may, Mr. Chair.

MR. SIMONS: Sure.

MS. WENDLER: I was wondering what we've allocated for demolition, and I just --

MR. SIMONS: Well, that's going into the Block Grant, we'll get to that next.

MS. WENDLER: I apologize. No wonder I didn't see it.

MS. BRUHN: The answer is six million.

MS. WENDLER: Okay.

MR. JEFFREY: One other point now. Does the waiver still -- is that still in existence?

MS. FERRIS: We understood that the waivers didn't exist, because the Empowerment Zone is over.

MR. JEFFREY: Is over, okay.

MS. FERRIS: The Planning Department has indicated differently, and that they may in fact extend those waivers.

MR. JEFFREY: Okay.

MS. FERRIS: Or take advantage of some -- some piece of the federal guidelines that allows us to go beyond the 10 years.

MR. JEFFREY: So that would probably help, because I see several groups in here that are in the Empowerment Zone. So I think with one of the groups, I see Latino Family Services, that's in there.

MR. SIMONS: Commissioner Cason?

DR. CASON: Yeah, this is my last attempt to understand, the money would be taken from the non-senior --

MR. JEFFREY: Home repair.

DR. CASON: -- home repair. Didn't we say that we would like to have more money in home repair and less money in demolition? Didn't we say something in regards to that?

MR. JEFFREY: We did say that, but our priority was senior home repair, and we said that we felt, in our discussions, that other home repair money should be tied to either code enforcement or to some type of --

MR. SIMONS: Low interest loan.

MR. JEFFREY: -- low interest loan. Since we don't have the time, the ability to put something like that in place, to me that's a place to get the money to take care of this. This won't hurt, I think, overall, we're not -- I think there's quite a few home repair groups in there, so this is not going to --

MS. FERRIS: Right. Well, there's 30 -- I think, 32 home repairs.

MR. JEFFREY: 32, so we're talking three million --

MS. FERRIS: It may be that you want to take a look at who you want to fund, and if there is anybody you want to unfund for whatever reason and then look at the whole picture -- I'm not saying walk through the whole group. But I think once you get to the Block Grant budget, you may find some places that maybe are more logical than the home repair to remove some funding from.

MR. JEFFREY: I see one, but I didn't want to bring it up.



MS. WENDLER: Just a point of clarification: Ms. Alcock is saying that in order to fund their recommended groups that we've identified, not only would we have to find money from --

MR. JEFFREY: Home repair.

MS. WENDLER: -- home repair, but we'd have to take 200,000 away from currently funded human service groups.

MS. ALCOCK: Public service.

MS. WENDLER: Public service. I'm sorry, public service.

MS. ALCOCK: Yes.

MS. WENDLER: Okay, I just wanted to be clear. Thank you.

MR. SIMONS: Well, is it feasible to collect those who have not spent the money, if you can do it? Take a look at the group and go over it, do what you can.

DR. CASON: Sure, I think we would have to first look at it, because if they didn't receive the money, you know, in time, it's not their fault that they haven't spent it. I think we would have to look at it and see why they didn't spend the money.

MR. SIMONS: Is it possible we could get a contract date when the money was allocated?

MS. ALCOCK: Well, as Ms. Ferris indicated, yes, we just got that information delivered to our office this morning so --

MR. SIMONS: You just got it in today.

MS. ALCOCK: -- we certainly will begin to go through that information and find obvious candidates where there would not be a lapse in funding. I think that's the goal, is to find groups that have enough money, and where their contract dates are situated so that they wouldn't have a lapse if they were not funded this year. The problem is that we would not be able to give you that list at this time.

MR. JEFFREY: Right.

MR. SIMONS: Right.

MS. ALCOCK: But we could certainly begin to work through that.  
I don't know what that does in terms of your desire to  
present a balanced budget to the Council for --

MR. SIMONS: Well, what we can do, in my opinion, is to do what  
you can with this group, look at it and fund what you can  
without going over budget.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Personally, before I vote on this, I would  
like to know what groups are going to lose money before I  
even, you know --

MR. SIMONS: Right, okay.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: -- would want to vote on this.

MR. JEFFREY: So you're saying -- oh, I'm sorry, Mr. Chair.

MR. SIMONS: Go ahead.

MR. JEFFREY: Based on the number of groups, it's what? It's  
500,000? You said we had 332- -- -22,000 left in public  
service that we can use.

MS. ALCOCK: Yes, that's true.

MR. JEFFREY: Before we hit the cap.

MS. ALCOCK: Right.

MR. JEFFREY: So if we took 322,000 from home repair, we  
wouldn't have a problem, and gave that amount to --

MS. ALCOCK: The number ends up becoming more than 20,000 that  
you have to take from home repair, which --

MR. JEFFREY: Okay, so we would be over the cap.

MS. ALCOCK: The problem is you're over the P.S. cap.

MR. JEFFREY: Right.

MS. ALCOCK: So it's a problem within the P.S. category.

MR. JEFFREY: Right, we would be over the P.S. cap.

MS. ALCOCK: About 200,000.

MR. SIMONS: Can you take money from home repair and put it back

into public service?

MS. ALCOCK: The solution has to happen within public service, at least for 200,000, the rest of it can be --

MR. SIMONS: How many -- how many people with home repair monies who have not spent the money? I don't know what program we're using, if the Planning Department didn't get the commitments from the community, didn't start repairing homes until (inaudible).

MS. ALCOCK: That was included in the package of information that was provided to us just this morning. The difficulty is that we do have a comprehensive list from the department which is going to be very helpful, the difficulty is that the department has given us a list of all the home repair groups in the whole universe, as opposed to -- we have to sort of cross-check that against the 32-plus Block Grant ones that are recommended in this budget. So that I'm sure that there will be groups that we can find, but again, it's another situation where we need to be able to cross-check the list.

MR. SIMONS: Well, Marsha, when do Council -- when do they have to vote?

MS. BRUHN: When do they have to vote?

MR. SIMONS: Yeah. When are they going to vote?

MS. BRUHN: Well, I'm not -- I'm not sure what date they're actually going to vote.

MS. FERRIS: It's scheduled for the 24th of May.

MS. BRUHN: Well, that's -- that's their final day, when they have to take action on the whole budget, the whole City budget.

MR. SIMONS: Okay.

MS. BRUHN: But usually what happens is, when they conclude their discussions on Block Grant and NOF, they usually have a straw vote.

MR. SIMONS: Straw vote.

MS. BRUHN: Now last year, I think the discussions went right

up, almost to the end of --

MS. FERRIS: Yeah, they actually have, the last couple of years.

MS. BRUHN: So, you know, they're -- but they're scheduled to start discussion on Monday, so we really have to have a report, a recommendation from the Planning Commission, by Monday morning. We were hoping to give them something tomorrow. Their Block Grant -- their Block Grant -- they've got discussions through April 21st and then I think, as I recall, they pick up in May or June, on a couple of days. I can look, I can check while I'm sitting here.

MR. JEFFREY: Then I would suggest, to make it simpler, and I know this is tough, that we do the number -- if we did six groups, we would still be within public service, right, cap?

MS. WENDLER: Right.

MR. JEFFREY: So I would suggest that we fund six groups -- six groups off this list. I have my suggested ones, but --

MR. SIMONS: Which are?

MR. JEFFREY: Which are just the ones I called off. I have some that I really think are great, and some that I would like to see --

MR. SIMONS: Just give us the ones you want.

MR. JEFFREY: Cut to the chase. Number 5.

MR. SIMONS: Number 5.

MR. JEFFREY: Dominican Literacy.

MR. SIMONS: Okay.

MS. FERRIS: What page of the chart; does somebody know where it is on the chart?

MS. JAMES: Yes, page 34.

MR. JEFFREY: Page 34. They would all get 50, right?

MS. FERRIS: Okay.

MR. JEFFREY: Number 204, Think Detroit.

MR. GLENN: Which one? What was that last one, Tony?

MR. JEFFREY: 204, Think Detroit.

MS. TILLMAN: Page 68 -- I mean, 86.

MR. JEFFREY: Number 316, Masters Mission (sic) -- I mean, Marygrove. I'm sorry.

MR. SIMONS: Marygrove. That's -- no, that's 316.

MR. JEFFREY: Right.

DR. CASON: What was the one before that? The one before that?

MR. JEFFREY: The one before that was Think Detroit.

DR. CASON: Think Detroit, okay.

MS. TILLMAN: Marygrove is located on 58?

MR. JEFFREY: Right.

MR. SIMONS: Mm-hmm.

MR. JEFFREY: Number -- okay, everybody, three so far, right?

MR. SIMONS: Yeah.

MR. JEFFREY: Number 74, Safe Center.

MR. SIMONS: 74, that's Safe Center; okay, that's four.

MR. JEFFREY: Right. Number 31, Manhood.

MR. SIMONS: That's five.

MR. JEFFREY: And Number 126, Don Bosco Hall.

MR. SIMONS: 126. (Inaudible) Michigan, is that the one? Which one is that now? I'm sorry.

MR. JEFFREY: I beg your pardon?

MR. SIMONS: Which one is 126?

MR. JEFFREY: 126 is Don Bosco Hall.

MR. SIMONS: Oh, Don Bosco. Okay, that's number six, right?

Now how can you tell us what monies you have for that right now; can you do that?

MS. ALCOCK: We're just slightly, slightly, slightly over in public service, but I think that it's okay, we can handle that; it's very insignificant. In terms of the overall overage, you would need to balance -- you would need to find 220,000 anywhere in the budget overall, so that could come from home repair, if that's your choice, or some other item, if that's your choice.

MR. SIMONS: Commissioner Glenn, you have a question?

MR. GLENN: Yeah. My question was concerning NOF and the home repair. You know, prior to -- I think this year or last year we were able to, like minor home repair, \$50,000, that's the most that we would put in, but I understand now they have put the lead into that pot, that we -- if they get a home, I mean, to build, if we eradicate the lead out of that pot, so that means that we're not getting the amount of home that we -- have been done over a period of year with the 15,000. If we got 60,000, we could do four homes, now we can't do that if they have any lead.

MR. SIMONS: 25,000, right?

MS. BRUHN: Well, you know, you might only be able to do two homes.

MR. SIMONS: Right.

MS. BRUHN: (Inaudible) two homes.

MR. GLENN: That's -- that's what I'm saying. So we can't look at that as -- now the way I'm seeing it, at \$60,000, that we can do four homes anymore. We may be able to do two. I'm saying that we cannot, at least see the Commission, see that we going to reduce home repair anymore, because of the fact that we have already allowed the lead to go into home repair. That may -- you said, if you get \$60,000, you got two homes, that's the most you can do.

MR. SIMONS: Well, that's true, Commissioner.

MR. GLENN: Am I right?

MR. SIMONS: That's a good point.

MS. ALCOCK: It is true, it is true. And that's precisely the reason that CRC chose to fund all the home repair groups at 100,000, because what that means is that they can actually do four houses.

MR. GLENN: That's my point right there, exactly. So, unless we -- I said earlier, I cannot see us reducing the CRC recommendation any lower than what it is already at this point, because the most you can get out of it is four homes at \$100,000, if they have any lead in it at all.

MR. SIMONS: Well, how would that affect it, if you took things from --

MS. ALCOCK: Well, you do have a problem in terms of, you need to find \$220,000 somewhere, but at this point anything is fair game. So as you look through, maybe the Block Grant chart or, you know, items in the NOF chart, if there's items that you think shouldn't be supported, that would -- that would help free up money. So it doesn't have to come from home repair, it could come from anything at this point. It's an overage that's overall in the budget.

DR. CASON: But if we're to do this tonight, you see, like the Commissioner just said, you can't vote on it.

MR. SIMONS: Is it true that --

DR. CASON: We're up in the air again now, a serious budget.

MS. BRUHN: Well, except -- could I, through the Chair?

MR. SIMONS: Go ahead.

MS. BRUHN: \$220,000 is not a lot of money to find when you look at the whole Block Grant.

MR. SIMONS: Right, right.

MS. BRUHN: So it may be that if you get concurrence that these are the -- well, these six groups plus the other one, if you agree these are the kind of groups you want to end, then I would suggest that you temporarily close down NOF and go to the Block Grant. And when you go through the Block Grant you may say, well, look, let's take 100,000 from this, or 50,000 from this, to get to that 220,000.

MR. JEFFREY: We got plenty of opportunities.

MR. SIMONS: Well, then let's defer this until we look at the Block Grant. Mr. Christensen?

MR. CHRISTENSEN: I have no problems.

MR. SIMONS: Okay. But, Heidi, you look like, that you're not quite ready with this suggestion.

MS. ALCOCK: Oh, no problem; no, no.

DR. CASON: She just don't want to be any further confused.

MR. SIMONS: She was almost like Don Knotts --

MR. GLENN: Mr. Chairman?

MR. SIMONS: Yeah.

MR. GLENN: And I'm looking at the Block Grant.

MR. SIMONS: Okay, we were fixed to go -- first of all, we're going to close out NOF for right now, continue to work on that, we'll go on to Block Grant. Is that okay?

MR. GLENN: Alright.

MR. SIMONS: Okay, go ahead.

MR. GLENN: Now am I correct, when I look at -- that's 144 on page 23, demolition and boarding, is that the one that we -- that resident demolition that we -- where we demolish homes and things of this nature? Mr. Chairman, may I speak?

MR. SIMONS: Yes, go ahead.

MR. GLENN: I would like to say, at this point in time, that we would accept the staff recommendation at the \$600,000 (sic).

MR. RIBBRON: Six million.

MR. GLENN: Huh?

MR. RIBBRON: Six million. That figure is six million.

MR. SIMONS: Six million, not 600,000.

MR. GLENN: Oh.



MR. SIMONS: Six 0's, six million.

MR. GLENN: Oh, I'm sorry, six million.

MR. SIMONS: But you're saying you recommend the six million instead of the seven million two hundred and two.

MR. GLENN: Yes, I am.

MR. SIMONS: Okay.

MR. JEFFREY: That's the staff recommendation.

MR. GLENN: The staff recommended six million, and I'm going along with their recommendation -- recommendations.

MR. SIMONS: But that might not find anything --

MS. WENDLER: That doesn't give us the money that we need to --

MR. SIMONS: Right, the Mayor is taking it out.

MS. WENDLER: Right, right. It would have to be deducted from that.

MR. JEFFREY: Yeah, it would have to be deducted from that six million.

MR. GLENN: Oh, okay.

MS. BRUHN: Mr. Chairman?

MR. SIMONS: Yeah.

MS. BRUHN: I would like the staff to speak to how we -- how we handle program income, just so that you all have a picture of that, because we have a difference from --

MS. WENDLER: What page is that?

MS. BRUHN: Well, it's actually the last page of the Block Grant chart, shows estimated program income.

MR. SIMONS: Last page?

MS. BRUHN: Right. There's a chart on the last page.

MR. SIMONS: The chart, okay, I see.

MS. BRUHN: Page 31 of the Block Grant.

MR. SIMONS: Right, I see, okay.

MS. BRUHN: And I just want you to understand, because it looks like we could have a lot more money available --

MR. SIMONS: Okay.

MS. BRUHN: -- for programming than we chose to take.

MR. GULOCK: On the last page, you'll see the Mayor listed -- under "Estimated Program Income" the Mayor listed 5,015,686 and that's made of the two costs -- that's made up of two items: one is the 2.6 million, which is from PD -- PDD administration; we get money from land sales and miscellaneous things. The other piece of it is from repayment from different projects, particularly 108 projects, and that total is about 1.4 million. So we've agreed -- our program income is about a million dollars less, it's 4,095,186. So we've agreed with this 2.6 million from land sales, etcetera, but we do not think his revenues for the 108s might be as high as he's projecting, because he's listed some projects that aren't up and running yet. So ours is a little -- ours is more conservative, I think. But I can go through the projects that we're talking about with you.

MR. JEFFREY: So is this four million actual or not?

MR. GULOCK: They're both projections of revenue.

MR. JEFFREY: Okay.

MR. GULOCK: The Mayor's is higher than ours.

MR. JEFFREY: So this is not money that we're using right now, this is just money we project coming?

MR. GULOCK: Well, it's part of the total and we're spending it.

MR. JEFFREY: We're spending it?

MR. GULOCK: It's part of the total of expected revenue added to the allocation from HUD, 43 million plus this number is what we have -- what we have to work with.

MR. JEFFREY: So when you got this four million from the Mayor's

projection, where did it go?

MR. GULOCK: No, the five million -- the five million is from the Mayor's.

MR. JEFFREY: Yeah, I mean, five million. But you said four, what did that -- what was it distributed to?

MS. WENDLER: Everything.

MR. GULOCK: There's no way to know.

MR. JEFFREY: Oh, you just calculated it as part of the overall budget?

MR. GULOCK: It's in his expenses, but there is no direct --

MR. JEFFREY: I mean, our expenses, in our staff allocations, where did we -- did we just spread it around?

MR. GULOCK: Correct.

MS. WENDLER: I would like to know, Mr. Gulock, which -- which of the repayments you do believe are coming in.

MR. GULOCK: The Mayor has listed five projects.

MS. WENDLER: Okay. His include?

MR. GULOCK: I'll go through them in the order that he has them. He has 720,000 coming in from the Book Cadillac Section 108, so the Book Cadillac Corporation would pay the City \$720,000 in revenue. The City Council did approve that 108, I think just last year, and I think it was about a 35 million dollar 108.

MS. WENDLER: Has it gone to -- has it closed?

MR. GULOCK: I'm not aware of a developer being selected for the project.

MS. WENDLER: So we don't even think that that's closed. Okay, well that's important.

MR. GULOCK: Right. I mean, we don't know if it's feasible at this point.

MS. WENDLER: Okay.

MR. GULOCK: That 725,000 we're not counting.

MS. WENDLER: Okay.

MR. GULOCK: So you can subtract that from the five million the Mayor's predicting.

MS. WENDLER: Okay.

MR. GULOCK: The next one is the Vernor Longdale project, it's a Section 108 loan, we just haven't received --

MS. WENDLER: It's not closed.

MR. GULOCK: Okay, it's not closed either, so that's a \$95,500 expected revenue that the Mayor is listing, and we're not expecting it.

MR. SIMONS: That's projected revenue.

MR. GULOCK: Yeah, we don't think it's realistic at this time.

MR. SIMONS: Okay.

MR. GULOCK: And we hope they prove us wrong. The next one is a Garfield Section 108 loan, that's on Woodward, south of Wayne State, and he's expecting \$238,169 in repayments and -  
-

MS. WENDLER: Do we know if that's closed?

MR. GULOCK: They've been -- that's been closed.

MS. WENDLER: And they've been paying?

MR. GULOCK: Well, we understand they have been paying the interest, but not the principal.

MS. WENDLER: Okay.

MR. GULOCK: So we've kept -- we're projecting that we'll receive the interest payment of \$133,169 this year, and not the principal, which --

MS. WENDLER: Interest only.

MR. GULOCK: Right, which is in the padding.

MS. WENDLER: Okay.

MR. GULOCK: And then the next one is Riverbend, which is -- they have been making their payments, and that's \$154,039, that we're expecting that as program income. And the last one is Caraco, Section 108, and that's about 1.1 -- well, it's \$1,129,785.

MR. SIMONS: That's Caraco?

MR. GULOCK: Yeah. And we expect them to make their payment.

MS. WENDLER: So they have been paying?

MR. GULOCK: Right.

MS. WENDLER: Okay.

DR. CASON: What happens if none of these people meet their obligations?

MR. GULOCK: It would have to be paid out of other sources of Block Grant Fund, probably unspent Block Grant Fund. The City would have to reprogram any unspent fund towards the repayments.

DR. CASON: And what happens -- I've been watching the Garfield thing -- how long can they go on just paying the interest; will it get larger, the principal, the interest will become more and more and more?

MR. GULOCK: I'm not sure, I think -- I'm not sure. Usually, sometimes the City will renegotiate the repayment schedule. We're not familiar with the day-to-day.

DR. CASON: But I mean, if we just took the logic of it --

MR. GULOCK: Yeah. The City would have to pay the principal payments for the -- for Garfield, but I'm not sure if we've had to do that, I'm not sure. Sometimes they take out bank loans. I'm not sure if they're doing that in this case.

DR. CASON: But that's more interest, isn't it?

MR. GULOCK: Right. That interest would have to be (inaudible).

DR. CASON: Gives me a headache.

MS. WENDLER: Because this has been one of my packaging over the years, it is very straight, the repaying. That's when

it was in the original Block Grant.

DR. CASON: That's the bed and breakfast?

MR. GULOCK: Right. If we could step back a little bit, there's five other 108 groups out there. I think five, maybe, they're listed in the chart, and we had numbers in them last week, but the Mayor is not putting numbers --

MS. WENDLER: Right.

MR. GULOCK: -- in his budget. There's Ferry Street, Stuberstone.

MS. WENDLER: Right.

MR. GULOCK: And I think Ferry -- Ferry Street Inn is not making everything.

MS. WENDLER: Okay. And New Amsterdam?

MR. GULOCK: That one I'd -- I'm not sure about that one.

MS. WENDLER: Because that's new, okay. Okay. And Garfield is Garfield I and II, so --

MR. GULOCK: Yeah, we accidentally combined them on our chart.

MS. WENDLER: Okay, okay. That's okay.

MR. GULOCK: Right.

MS. WENDLER: Alright, I just wanted an update on this.

MR. GLENN: I'm still on --

MR. SIMONS: Huh?

MR. GLENN: I'd still like to discuss this demolition.

MR. SIMONS: Okay.

DR. CASON: What page are you on?

MR. SIMONS: It's page 23.

MR. GLENN: 23.

MR. SIMONS: Go ahead.

MR. GLENN: No, I'm asking the question with that, how can we reduce this amount of money that the Mayor has --

MR. SIMONS: No, he's -- you're talking about the CRC staff recommended six million.

MR. GLENN: Right.

MR. SIMONS: Arrived at that because you thought that was conservative, is that right?

MS. BRUHN: Well, we know that the Commissioners are stressing home repair.

MR. SIMONS: Right.

MS. BRUHN: And neighborhood preservation. And we also know that demolition is not proceeding the way it used to.

MR. SIMONS: Okay.

MS. BRUHN: There was a time when -- Mr. Loper and I both remember it, we were talking about it earlier -- when the Block Grant demolition money ran out, like in January, and there was no money for the rest of the year, and so the City would borrow ahead on next year's money. Well, we're just doing a lot less demolition than we used to.

MS. WENDLER: That's good news.

MS. BRUHN: Well, as long as we're not getting further behind, it's good news. But it is true that when -- when dangerous buildings are brought before City Council now, a lot of them are withdrawn because people are, you know, planning the rehabs on them, so that part is good, there aren't as many. But anyway, we -- we cut it down -- I guess I should ask staff to respond -- but we cut it down because -- because of the Commissioners' priorities, and to try to focus more of the Block Grant money on preservation and rehab/stabilization activities.

MR. GLENN: That's why I -- you know, I was looking at it and I think in our prior discussion we talked about going after ones that -- only these buildings to get our money back from them based upon the fact that we have money here, we done paid out the money to demolish the building, and now we were saying that they should be responsible for repaying the City for demolishing that building and that's -- that's the

reason why I'm saying I don't think we need it any more if we're going to -- and we are taking that stand on trying to get the ones who own the buildings to repay the money to the City.

MR. SIMONS: Go ahead. Susan, first.

MS. GLASER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I agree with neighborhood preservation, but I think you have to have a neighborhood to preserve it, okay? Now I want to reiterate what happened, bring back two years, what happened to me. My block was fully intact two years and four months ago. At the time we had a fire in a home down the street from me, it's been boarded up for 28 months, they just took it down Saturday. In the meantime, I have two more boarded up homes on my block in the last week and a half. I don't know that demolition is where we should cut. Maybe there's some other things we should be doing with demolition. If they're doing less demolition and getting more money or the same amount of money, we should be looking at what we're being charged.

MR. SIMONS: That's true.

MS. GLASER: And I asked last week to look at how many houses are going down on the west side as opposed to the east side, because it took 28 months to get a beautiful brick home torn down in my neighborhood, it was completely demolished in that second fire.

MR. SIMONS: Tell me this, Susan, one house was torn down, do you think it could have been reserved -- preserved?

MS. GLASER: No.

MR. SIMONS: It could not be preserved?

MS. GLASER: There is no way.

MR. SIMONS: No way?

MS. GLASER: Uh-uh. In fact, 28 months, the first time we seen the owner of the house since, who by the way was the person that was convicted of burglary, he went to jail, he's out, he came back the next day and wanted to know who tore down his house. In the meantime, like I said, on Good Friday morning, the house across the street from him, with beautiful brick ledge, went up in flames. This past Saturday night, the corner house on my block, the brick



house -- I woke up Sunday morning, on my way to church, it was boarded up. I'm through. We have to do something about demolition.

MR. SIMONS: Okay, Tony.

MR. JEFFREY: I will say I feel your pain, but the thing is, you feed a monster like demolition, it never ends. You're putting in 15, 20 million dollars a year, and we still -- 15, I was with the Planning Commission 15 years, I was there when they were putting 15 million dollars in demolition, 20 million dollars, it never stops. The more money you put in, they just tear down more houses and more vacant houses pop up. It becomes a never-ending cycle. As long as you put the money there, contractors are going to -- like you said, the one guy, burned his house. Okay, the City tore it down, is the City going to get their money back from him?

MS. GLASER: I don't have a clue.

MR. JEFFREY: No.

MS. GLASER: But let me -- let me respond to you, Mr. Jeffrey, when you're finished. Go ahead.

MR. JEFFREY: Okay, the point I'm trying to make on demolition is, our tax dollars and Mr. Glenn, Commissioner Glenn and others, our tax dollars are constantly fueling the fire of abandonment. As long as people know we're going to take care of their property, we're going to tear it down, and vacant, burn it and leave it, they're going to keep doing it. And what -- I was listening to Chris talking about program income -- what program income came from that 20 million dollars that we spent? What program income? If I tear -- tear down your house and have to be responsible for moving the waste and burying it, when am I getting my money back? We're not getting it back. So people just burn their house, walk away, leave it, and we dummies, City of Detroit come along, because we got to tear down these houses, and we tear them down and never get our money back. And then the same people we tear down their houses, and pack their bricks and stuff up, sit up and tell us what a terrible city we are, and how raggedy it is, and we're spending our taxpayer dollars to tear down their houses, and we don't get any money back from it.

MS. GLASER: Can I respond?

MR. JEFFREY: That is absolutely --

MS. GLASER: Now I'm going to respond to you. You're singing to the choir, but I would bet money, how many people on this Commission have abandoned, torn up homes on their block that they're living next door to, that rats are running in and out of? How many people on this Commission are in the predicament I'm in?

MR. JEFFREY: I understand.

MS. GLASER: Which most Detroiters are in.

MR. JEFFREY: I understand.

MS. GLASER: Okay.

MR. JEFFREY: But I think our approach has got to be more measure.

MS. GLASER: I understand that.

MR. JEFFREY: You just can't keep throwing money at the problem of demolition, and that's what we've been doing.

MS. GLASER: I agree with that, and I said that to begin with.

MR. JEFFREY: Okay, I agree, alright.

DR. CASON: Before you -- just get a light bulb for me.

MS. GLASER: Say it again?

DR. CASON: A light bulb.

MR. SIMONS: Go ahead.

MS. WENDLER: You know, one of the things that we can do, that begins to address, I think, our priorities, is the demolition dollars need to go into the neighborhood. None of those demolition dollars should be used -- and particularly to Mr. Jeffrey's point -- for commercial building.

MR. JEFFREY: Right.

MS. WENDLER: I mean, let's make sure, and I don't know how we do this, Ms. Bruhn, but if there is any way we could

recommend to City Council, that with limited demolition dollars we want to ensure that every last penny of those dollars goes into neighborhood, critical public health and safety hazards, as opposed to, you know, commercial building. And commercial building is supposed to make money, so if it's not making money, that property owner either needs to sell it or take it down at his own cost. And when we've got limited public funds to do the kinds of public health and safety issues that Commissioner Glaser is referring to, I think we need to be incredibly targeted with our dollars.

MR. SIMONS: Do you have a question? Dr. Cason, you have a comment?

DR. CASON: No, I just want a light bulb.

MR. SIMONS: Okay, go ahead. I'm sorry.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: You know, I got to, have to agree with Susan on this. Her block is a good -- is a good explanation of what happens when you don't tear houses down. It's like a cancer. You know, if you wait a while -- you know, she had what, two years four months from the time the first one burned 'til the next one burned and the next one burned. I guarantee you, she's going to have more houses burn on her block if they don't tear down the houses down there. And I agree that the owner should go ahead, there is supposed to be -- there's an ordinance in the City of Detroit where the insurance companies are supposed to hold back money before they pay off these houses. But how many houses in the city of Detroit are insured? You know, how do you get money, you know, from a dead horse? Let's put it that way. And I think we have to go out and keep demolishing, because if we don't it's going to be a cancer, we're going to lose the rest of the city of Detroit. I mean, that's just my feelings.

MR. GLENN: Yeah, I think we're looking at, what we're saying is wrong -- we are not saying, I am not saying don't demolish the homes, I'm not saying that.

MR. SIMONS: Right.

MR. GLENN: I'm saying get it done as quick as possible, but go after the owner. If we have to tear down, go after the owner, and that money would be replenished back into this

demolition. That's all I'm saying.

MS. WENDLER: They owned the house. They have as much of an asset as a house.

MR. GLENN: I'm not saying don't -- that leave this block of abandoned homes up. I'm saying, if they need to be torn down tomorrow, take them down. But then, after, if they don't have the money to take them down then, after, we go after them. You see what happened, and if you remembered years ago, that the landlord went to and appealed the landlord/tenant law, and we didn't have anything to force them to take these homes down for many, many years, but now we do have, under the maintenance -- department, Administration, if you read that, they have now, they can go after these owners to get their money back into demolition.

MR. SIMONS: Susan.

MS. GLASER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'd just like to respond. You know, even if it's in the ordinance, the time that it would take us to set up a program could be another 28 months, which would mean how many more neighborhoods in the city of Detroit would suffer what my neighborhood is going through these past 28 months; you know what I'm saying? So if you cut it now, before the program is up and running, it's like cutting our own throat. I'm saying to get the program going first and then, you know, by all means go after, get the money back, but protect the people that are here now, that are paying the taxes, and are struggling to keep their neighborhoods viable.

MR. SIMONS: Okay, Tony?

MR. JEFFREY: One last point. If I'm baking a cake and I got all the ingredients except -- if I got sugar, sugar is needed to make a cake, but if I don't have the rest of the ingredients, I can do anything I want and it's not -- I'm not going to get a cake. All those neighborhoods, it's more than just demolition that's creating the problems in our neighborhoods. It's more than just an abandoned house, because I know a lot of unstable neighborhoods with abandoned houses on them, and they live with those abandoned houses for years, but they cut the yard, they do other things to make sure that that abandoned house did not tear their neighborhood down. We are being bled as a city, I don't even want to go back and find out how much demolition

money we spent. And some of it is good, don't get me wrong, I'm not saying -- but contractors and people out there are bleeding the city of millions and millions of dollars. At first they used to take the stuff away; now they just dump it in the hole and bury it. So when somebody comes along the land, tries to build a new house, they got a bunch of bricks and stuff, now they just go through, tear a house down, dump the stuff in the hole, and move on. I mean they are bleeding us, and we just keep pumping money, chugging money into the hole. And I'm going to ask you, 15, 20 years down the road, you're going to still have abandoned properties, unless you have a strategy with demolition being a part of it, not a way to save neighborhoods, it is just one piece of the pie. And I think we were saying that if you just keep putting money in, nobody -- I remember when we -- I'll frame it up -- when Mayor Archer was in, they said, "We're going to borrow 60 million dollars," on top of the 15 million dollars that we were already spending, and they said -- and they said -- and Council said, "Okay, but you got to give us a housing strategy." "We're going to give you one. First, give us 20 million." Okay, they gave them the 20 million; they spent that for demolition. Okay, "Now we need 15- more." Okay, we gave them that for demolition. They spent 60 million dollars, on top of the money we were already spending, now we're paying money back to the federal government for 60 million dollars that we took, and do we -- have we solved the problem? And I'm saying, at some point you got to say wait a minute, let's think this thing through. Demolition is not --

MR. SIMONS: Susan may respond, and I have a comment.

MR. JEFFREY: One last point. If we're going to do -- I'm not going to test demolition at this point right now, since she said that, but I just think at some point, if we're going to spend the money to tear the houses down, we got to have an aggressive program to collect it back, and we don't have that. And that was our thinking on it; if you keep putting the money in without getting it back, then you're going to just keep putting it in.

MS. GLASER: I agree with you. I'm not --

MR. JEFFREY: I know you're not opposing it. I say, okay, leave the demolition money.

MS. GLASER: But what I want to respond to that, is that for the

last 28 months I've been listening to my neighbors who, by the way, which I failed to remind everybody, about a third of my block has moved, and a third of the homes on my block that used to be owner-occupied are now renter-occupied, so we're adding even further to it -- they left because of that abandoned house; they left because nobody was responding to their phone calls. Even though they were, they didn't understand that our process is slow, and I'm being kind. So I guess that's what I'm saying; if you turn around and tell the citizens now we're reducing the money, and they're sitting on top of houses in their neighborhood that they're watching all the time to keep people from pulling children into them and things like that -- that's horrible, I can't even in good conscience say I would support that. You know, and I can't -- the other side, I can't say in good conscience I want to throw more money down the hole either, so maybe the answer is to take the money out of the political arena and let the citizens tell where that money is going to go.

MR. JEFFREY: I'd vote for that.

MR. SIMONS: Okay. Now if there's an ordinance in place, that we can go after the homeowner and get the money back from buildings or homes, is that in place?

MS. BRUHN: I don't believe it -- no, it's not in place.

MR. SIMONS: See, I think what we need to do here is create a document, create the ordinance, to go after the homeowner or the building owner to get the money back.

MR. GULOCK: Yeah, we did have the Law Department respond to that question, and they did submit a response just today, and we passed it out.

MR. SIMONS: What did they say, in essence?

MR. GULOCK: Well, in essence, they said it's very difficult to do.

MR. SIMONS: Why is it difficult to do?

MR. GULOCK: They give several reasons. The first reason, one reason is, they say it's very difficult to find the owner of records. They say, also, some of these are owned by corporations, so that those corporations are created to

protect them -- the question we asked them is: Will you put liens on other properties they own around the State of Michigan? Which the City Code allowed, but they said the City does not do this, and they said it's difficult, because it's difficult to track who the owner was.

MR. SIMONS: Who -- who paid the taxes on this house?

MR. GULOCK: And --

MR. SIMONS: Who paid the taxes?

MR. GULOCK: Well, it was -- it was a person, but sometimes they say -- there's also a six-year window, I guess. If you don't get to the owner within six years, you can't go after them. And a lot times the property doesn't come into the demolition system until six years is almost up, so we can't go after them. But it would be good if you read over the letter, but that's a general summary.

MR. JEFFREY: So nothing we can do.

MR. SIMONS: That's a general summary. Well, I think we should save this for discussion at a different time. Go ahead.

DR. CASON: Frustrations have been expressed before. I don't think we can do -- seriously, Commissioners, I don't think we can do much about this problem.

MR. SIMONS: Go ahead.

MR. GLENN: Just the last month, I asked the Mayor the very same question. The Mayor said to me and I tell him, at a meeting in northwest Detroit, that we have in place now, because of the changing of the law in Lansing, that we are able to go after the landlords, who own these buildings that we are demolishing, and we will be able to get our money back from them. Those are pretty well the words that he said in a meeting with approximately, about 20 or 25 of us. Because of the changing of the law in Lansing, that they were able to do it. Now that's what he --

MR. GULOCK: I did forget to mention, the Law Department said they have not filed any liens against any properties because, partly because they haven't been asked. So if the Council -- if they are asked to file liens against properties --

MS. WENDLER: Right, exactly, nobody has asked this.

MR. SIMONS: Nobody has asked.

MR. GULOCK: Because none have been referred -- none have been referred to the Law Department for investigation. So if we -- we could ask the Council on your behalf.

MR. SIMONS: Okay. Is he telling you -- the Law Department telling you that we can't do it, or we haven't done it because they haven't been asked?

MR. GULOCK: Well, both. They say it's difficult to do, but they're also saying we haven't been asked. So I'm curious what percentage could -- could we go after.

MS. BRUHN: Because it does sound, from the letter -- as Mr. Gulock indicated, we got a lot of documents today -- they're basically saying we can't do it post -- we can't go after every person but, you know, if you could go after even 15 or 20% of the properties --

MR. JEFFREY: Yes.

MS. BRUHN: -- it would set a tone, it would begin to change the thinking, the culture, which is, "Oh, I just can just go and do anything I want and nobody will come after me."

MR. SIMONS: I would suggest that we go with the six million staff has recommended, and try to put in place for -- for the City to ask the Law Department to go after people that they can, some of these people to get the money back.

MS. GLASER: So can't we -- excuse me, Mr. Chair -- your recommendation was to go to the businesses first?

MS. WENDLER: Well, that any demolition -- that the priorities for demolition be in the neighborhoods first, the neighborhood houses, because of the public health and safety issue.

MS. GLASER: Right.

MS. WENDLER: And to commercial buildings, second. But certainly, if we're going to try to collect, we ought to collect on the commercial buildings as a priority, because those are supposed to be money-producing. A commercial property is supposed to be adding to the tax base, adding to



the income in the city. And if someone is sitting on a commercial building and letting it rot, shame on us for letting them do that. It needs to be productive or they need to take it down.

DR. CASON: But you have another problem. If you're cutting employees at this time, at this time we don't even have the employees to go out and enforce this, investigate it. If you're going to be cutting people now, how are you going to do this?

MR. SIMONS: Well, we do it somewhere, we have to cut more than  
-

MR. JEFFREY: It would be worth it, a lot of corporations, they don't have -- they don't want to waste their time, so they tell somebody, "Hey, you recover this money for us, you get to keep 5% of everything you recover." You turn somebody loose on these people and I guarantee you they will recover the money. 5% of what we spend -- man, that will keep somebody comfortable for a long time. I don't accept that you can't do it. If you want to do it, you do it. There is a way.

MR. GULOCK: Just, if I may, just to give Ms. Wendler more background, every year we knock out about 5 -- about 5% of total demolition, 5 to 10% are for commercial buildings. So, for example, next year we expect to knock down 1,400 buildings, 200 would be commercial, 1,200 are residential. There is a pattern for the last four years of 5 to 10% are commercial. Whether you want it to be less than that, it's up to you.

MR. JEFFREY: And commercial buildings are usually more expensive, right?

MS. WENDLER: Because they're bigger, right.

MR. JEFFREY: So if we just collected on the commercial buildings.

MS. WENDLER: Right, exactly.

MR. SIMONS: Okay, we're going to have to move on, get through this.

MR. JEFFREY: We still have to -- Mr. Chair, we still have to come up with two hundred and some thousand. Since Ms.

Glaser took away our number one target, we have to look somewhere else.

MR. SIMONS: No, we're on Block Grant.

MR. JEFFREY: We're on the Block Grant, but we got to come up with the money for NOF.

MR. SIMONS: We're going to find it.

MR. GLENN: We going to find that someday, somehow.

MR. SIMONS: Okay, I guess I'm looking at page 23, Brush Park Redevelopment.

MR. GULOCK: This is to resurface several streets on the Block Grant -- Block Grant area. I think, five streets. We're recommending 450-, the Mayor wants, is asking for 1,000 (sic).

DR. CASON: One million. You like me. Mr. Gulock, how many houses on Brush Park?

MR. GULOCK: I'm not sure.

MR. SIMONS: Well, I think -- I think we can find the money right there, Heidi.

MR. GULOCK: I could step back a little bit. There's about five -- five or six redevelopment projects that the Mayor is asking money for. The far east side, Brush Park, Virginia Park, Garfield and --

DR. CASON: By the way, speaking of Brush Park, did you find out anything about the water and that lady?

MR. JEFFREY: I talked to one of the staff. I think they got her water back, from what I understand.

DR. CASON: Ms. Gloss (ph).

MR. LOPER: Yeah. Yeah, we have been in contact with her and the Water Department. The Water Department is going out to her house tomorrow to see what the situation is.

MR. SIMONS: To see what the situation is?

MR. LOPER: Right, right. They had -- they had taken her meter

out, they thought that the property was vacant, but they hadn't -- according to their records, they hadn't had a request to turn it back on, they didn't have input, so she owes about how much?

MS. BRUHN: A very small amount.

MR. LOPER: A very small amount, not really significant.

MS. BRUHN: I guess, you know, just speaking to that, she has come, I think, to most public hearings on Brush Park over the years, way back, I would say 15 years I can remember, and this is the first time that any of us can recall that she spoke of a water problem. So, you know, we're not sure what the whole story is, but at least we are working diligently.

MR. SIMONS: Good, I appreciate that.

MR. JEFFREY: The far east side project, are we going to do anything with --

MR. SIMONS: Chris, you can try --

DR. CASON: We have a million dollars?

MS. ALCOCK: Again, you're talking about 220-, it's actually 220,120 -- 128, so \$220,128 that you're trying to find, and I think as -- you know, there's some new items in your chart that weren't there when we last met, last week. We just, we're just responding to the Mayor's cuts. So it may be that you want to look at some of the other city projects as well, and decide how you would like to reduce some of those in order to come up with that 220-.

MR. JEFFREY: Yeah, I go back to, I was asking what the difference was from last week's chart and this week's. Now the staff recommended 450-, the Mayor -- so we go with the 450-.

DR. CASON: It's 450,000, right?

MR. GLENN: Right. That's all I'm asking.

MS. ALCOCK: Yeah, I can actually respond to that. The major differences, that you will find that there are no changes, at least from the chart that you have last, and I don't believe any changes from the chart you have last week, as it

relates to Block Grant community organizations, but there are some very major changes as it relates to the Section 108 repayments which, because the Mayor has not put them in the budget, even though they're listed in the chart, you can see that they're listed at 0. There's also some major changes, some additions to the city projects in order to respond to the Mayor's budget. And then, also, there are some changes, now that we have figures for the City department, the City staff that are supported by Block Grant, you'll see some changes there. So really, the major changes do begin on 23, page 23.

MR. SIMONS: Page 23.

MS. BRUHN: Okay, so Chris can you walk through -- is it alright, Mr. Chairman --

MR. SIMONS: Sure.

MS. BRUHN: -- if we walk through, just point out the --

MR. SIMONS: Okay. What is the first one?

MS. BRUHN: You want the one that's dated April 14th, that has a cover on it.

MR. SIMONS: Mine has got April --

MS. BRUHN: No, you want the one with the cover -- with the cover.

MR. SIMONS: Oh, this one here.

MS. BRUHN: That's the new one today.

MR. SIMONS: Alright.

MR. GULOCK: Some of these we had in last week, but we didn't know where the Mayor -- what way he was going to ask for. So Brush Park, I'm not sure if we had it in last week, but he's asked for a million to repave roads, to reduce many of the roads. I think, overall, the Mayor needs about 25 million dollars to make -- to do infrastructure changes in Brush Park, and we have been giving him a little bit each year. He had some bond money, but he's asking for a million; we're recommending 450-.

MR. JEFFREY: How much did he get last year? Did they spend

last year's money?

MR. GULOCK: We just -- we just received from the Mayor this morning the status on some of the old contracts for Block Grant, so let me try to -- so we asked Planning Department several questions, we just got the response this morning, which kind of puts us behind. But if you look at -- if you look at the -- well, the chart they gave us, it basically says Brush Park redevelopment, 577,000, about half has been paid out.

MR. SIMONS: Where are we at?

MR. GULOCK: Oh, this is just a chart the Mayor's staff gave us.

MR. SIMONS: Okay, I'm sorry. Go ahead.

MR. JEFFREY: So they got 500- last year, half was paid.

MR. GULOCK: Okay. Last year, Brush Park received -- what we're pointing to is the Mayor's number, which prevailed, \$411,512. If you look on the PD's status report, it doesn't list that amount, but it's the target of the status -- we're not sure, the status of it, but I think they did two streets last year, but I'm not positive.

MR. JEFFREY: So, Mr. Chair, that's the updated -- update?

MR. GULOCK: It's the contract status report.

MR. JEFFREY: It only reflects the 500,000 that they received last year?

MR. GULOCK: They might have -- they might have lumped all the money together.

MR. JEFFREY: So how much is left?

MR. GULOCK: I can't make an accurate assessment. There's a lot of money here, but I'm not sure.

MR. JEFFREY: How much is there?

MR. GULOCK: Well, there's Brush Park Development Corp. which is separate, so there's Brush Park NSA, it says there's a \$98,000 contract, 23,000 been paid, 75,000 remains; then there's a Brush Park redevelopment which is 577,000, 238,000 has been paid, 339,000 has not -- is unpaid balance.

MR. JEFFREY: Okay.

MR. GULOCK: You know, but how that relates to the 411- they got last year, we're not sure. I think if you fund them, they'll definitely spend it, because like I said, they have 25 million in needs, so we were giving them a little bit to help them move forward, but not everything in the --

MR. JEFFREY: A lot of people got needs, but they haven't spent the money. Okay.

MR. GULOCK: If you turn to page 24.

MR. JEFFREY: The community toolbox, page 23. You have there such a great presentation, I had gotten all excited, then I look at the amount of money in there and I said that's probably enough to have a few community dinners, that's about it. Weren't we talking about a community -- a city-wide forum and initiating some -- some community efforts, and all these kind of things?

MR. RIBBRON: Mr. Chair, I can respond to that. You are correct, we initially think that we could do a couple of the community meetings, put the toolbox together to get information out to groups, but we also feel that we can go to the banks and have -- ask them to support this; we feel that this is one that the banks will be able to support, so we feel that this will be able to leverage some of the other dollars to jump-start the program.

MR. JEFFREY: 25,000?

MS. TILLMAN: Commissioner Jeffrey, the thinking with this is, this is the money for the neighborhood summit and getting the materials ready for the summit, but not the program itself. We want to do that as the initial start-up, and then we want to put in more money as we get set up and prepare to handle more capacity.

MR. JEFFREY: A summit for 25,000, city-wide, materials, facility, now you got to have food, trainers.

MR. SIMONS: Okay, Tony, your imagination is running away with you.

MR. JEFFREY: No, no, no. I mean, if you're going to do a summit, if you're going to do it right, you got to do it, you got to jump out the gate right, otherwise you send the

message that you're not serious.

MS. BRUHN: Give us a dollar figure. I think we can probably match it, I'll try.

MR. JEFFREY: You think you can raise it; so you think you can raise it to 50-? You think you can match it, get 25,000 match.

MS. WENDLER: And I think that other partner match is really important to the success of the program, I mean, because we really want those partners. Not, I'm not saying --

MR. JEFFREY: No, no, no. If they're out there --

MS. WENDLER: I just think it's really important that it not just be a state effort.

MR. JEFFREY: Right, I agree, but my experience with D.O.C.T.O.R. and other programs is that you got to get it started, show people that you're serious, show people that it works, otherwise you fall in the cracks. But if you're all happy with it, I'm happy. Let's move on.

MR. SIMONS: Chris, you said, page 24.

MR. GULOCK: New, at the top of the chart, Eastern Market public improvements, the Mayor is asking 400,000. We haven't got a response from the staff yet about what they want to spend that on.

MR. SIMONS: So you had recommended 300,000, right?

MR. GULOCK: Right.

MR. SIMONS: Okay.

DR. CASON: Could I?

MR. SIMONS: Go ahead.

DR. CASON: How -- how can you recommend 300,000, any more than they can recommend 400,000, we don't know what they want to do with it?

MR. GULOCK: We just, we have calls and we haven't their responses yet.

MR. SIMONS: You know, this discussion reminds me, somebody ran in a political campaign not too long ago, "voodoo economics," and I know we're sincere, but it feels like we're spinning our wheels.

MS. BRUHN: Well, you know -- well, you know, it's frustrating because we just got the Mayor's figures Tuesday and we really couldn't, I don't think could start working until Tuesday afternoon. But what we do know on Eastern Market, is there is an Eastern Market advancement coalition, which the City Council and the Mayor supported, it's taking the leadership out there. There is a whole planning strategy to actually create, sort of an umbrella group that's going to guide the improvements out there. There is a plan that was presented to Council for the sheds initially, to enclose one of the sheds, to bring, to do landscaping, to make it a more inviting area, to -- to expand, because the market is now one day a week, to try to expand on the market activities by having other -- other groups located out there, or activities that would be other days of the week. So there's -- there's a pretty ambitious physical improvement program that's going to go with this. The problem is we don't know exactly what, you know, the thought for the first \$400,000, but that plan has been presented to City Council, and I think Council was very receptive to it. Because the idea is to make it -- to, first of all, to retain its viability and expand its attractiveness. And as you know, physical -- you know, the physical aspects of the market are not that, really that inviting. When there are lots of people, you don't notice it, but, you know --

MR. SIMONS: Well, I think the staff has done a lot, because some things you just received this morning from them, and pushing it all --

MS. BRUHN: Right, and we've been -- you know, we met what? All day yesterday afternoon, we met all, I think, this morning and half the afternoon, trying to go over what we had so --

DR. CASON: I love Eastern Market, I'm through there at least four times a month, and the only thing that gets me is parking, and about just driving through.

MS. BRUHN: And parking is part of the -- of this, of the strategy, you know, doing some work on the parking structure. There was a major session that Urban Land Institute ran, and there were many, numerous suggestions



that came out of that.

DR. CASON: At the Gem Theater, University of Michigan, is that what it was?

MS. BRUHN: Was it at the Gem? Was it at the Gem? Yes, yes. And then there were --

MR. GULOCK: There was two. Urban Land Institute did one major study and then University of Michigan did one about a month later, in January or February.

DR. CASON: Well, that's one of the neglected jewels of the city. We see them going down, Belle Isle, that, you know --

MS. BRUHN: Right. And the other thing is that outlying communities are starting to have markets, so they're beginning to pull people away from our market. The idea, one of the other aspects of this, it's not really the public improvement, but it's another aspect of marketing the market, is to increase the quality of goods that were sold there. Sometimes there's a sense that, you know, it's not first-rate products, the products aren't necessarily first rate and, you know, trying to encourage more home-grown products. So we're supportive of this, it's just that we can't tell you exactly what they would do with the first 400,000, or 300,000.

MR. SIMONS: Okay. No, we're making progress. Go right ahead.

MR. GULOCK: The next major project -- the next major project is the far east side improvements.

MR. SIMONS: What page is that now?

MR. GULOCK: Right below Eastern -- two below Eastern Market.

MR. SIMONS: Okay.

MR. GULOCK: The far east side improvements, this is a major initiative by the Administration, and this -- I think this is for one of the phases of the far east side, it's called the Fox Creek project; it's to do infrastructure, capital improvements for the area bounded by Newport on the west, Kercheval on the north, Alter on the east, and Jefferson on the south. The total cost I think are 2.7 million, but the Mayor is asking for 2.1 million. We -- we are supportive of the project. We are at this time recommending two million.

At the bottom of the page is the Garfield Redevelopment II Project. This is a new project that the Council did approve a Section 108 loan last year for 17 million. It's just starting to get off the ground. This is also for infrastructure improvements; sidewalks, street lighting.

MR. SIMONS: Where is it located, Chris?

MR. GULOCK: It's east of Woodward and south of Warren, so it's south of Wayne State. I think the street is Forest.

MR. SIMONS: Garfield, between John R and Woodward, is that the one?

MR. GULOCK: Just west of the Medical Center, between Woodward and the Medical Center, just west of the Veterans Hospital. There's two streets, and they want to rehab three apartment buildings; they want to redevelop some commercial spaces, build a parking deck, and really make more of an artist community. There's a couple of galleries there now.

MR. SIMONS: Garfield and Canfield, that's one of the streets. I used to live down there.

MR. JEFFREY: Just in this one page, there's about what, \$550,000 in public improvements. There's a lot of groups out there doing new construction, and are we going to target money to help them with public improvements, doing in-fill housing, building new homes in neighborhoods and, you know, really pushing to try to bring neighborhoods up and increase the property values. You know, is there a strategy on how we do these public improvements or is it -- is it more a political thing? Because, you know, there's people out there who are trying to get money and they're actually building low/moderate income housing, they're building market rate inside neighborhoods, and they have a struggle getting this kind of money. I mean how -- how are we determining to put two million on the far east side versus money in some of the other areas, southwest Detroit or other neighborhoods where there is major housing development going on?

MR. GULOCK: That's a very good question. We do have some CDOs asking for alley repavings --

MR. JEFFREY: On the streets?

MR. GULOCK: Yeah, in terms of the streets, I'm not sure of how the City --

MR. JEFFREY: Oh, yeah.

MR. GULOCK: Well, I'm not sure how the City deals with the infrastructure.

MR. JEFFREY: All I'm saying is from now on, you know, if there's a -- if there's a group doing some major developing in an area, the City should commit, you know, money to help support that, and I don't know how it's determined, but I know that there is a lot of groups that can't get it.

MR. GULOCK: Right. And I think we're going to start needing -- need to ask the Administration to be more up front with some of the big picture for each project, because now we have about five, and we just added Virginia Park, and these are big projects; they don't turn in an application like the rest of the groups. And we need to know how many years are we talking, because for all we know, the far east side could be --

MR. JEFFREY: Right.

MR. GULOCK: -- a 20-year commitment, and so it's something we're going to have to --

MR. SIMONS: Commissioner Glenn has a question.

MR. GLENN: If I could just look at this, and I'm on page 27 -- I don't want you to change it, but I'm looking at the picture, that they're putting things before human beings, and I'm looking at the Mayor's side of this picture. I'm looking at the senior emergency home repair. When I look at that and see he is valuing the streets, and all of these things, much more than he is, a human being that has a place to stay. \$200,000, that was the same thing last year that was put in for senior program, and they ran out. Half of the people didn't even get an application, because they ran out before the 200,000 -- the 200- was taken. But yet I see right below that, Virginia Park redevelopment is 800-and-some thousand dollars, but yet when you look up there at seniors, who pays his salary, a majority of it, and he only recommended 200,000.

MR. SIMONS: It's two million.

MR. GLENN: I mean, two million. I'm sorry, you know what I mean, two million. You know what I mean.

MR. SIMONS: I know what you mean.

MR. GLENN: Two million.

MR. SIMONS: But see, don't worry about what that is, what we going to pass on to the Council?

MR. GLENN: Yeah, but the thing of it is, it bothers me when I see that, when you talk about people.

MR. SIMONS: Some would say you're singing to the choir. We'll move on. Go ahead, Chris.

MR. GLENN: I'm sorry, but I just --

DR. CASON: Just get me a light bulb. They say, if you say something enough, things will happen.

MR. SIMONS: Go ahead, Chris. Or, I'm sorry --

MR. JEFFREY: Do we -- do we need to go through the whole thing?

MR. SIMONS: No, he's going to point out the ones that he wants to point out and we'll cover those.

MR. GULOCK: I'll try to go faster. But on page 25 is that Human Services Drug Abuse Program for 80,000; we mention this is new that the Mayor added. This would go against the public service path. If you turn to page 26 --

MS. WENDLER: Question, Mr. Gulock. Is that normally funded some other way and now it's coming into Block Grant, is that the deal? Would the Health Department normally --

MR. GULOCK: I'm not sure. Deb might know.

MS. FERRIS: As I understand it, the Mayor is recommending that pieces of the Human Services Department merge into Planning and Development, and some other pieces merge into the Health Department. The component that's moving to the Planning Department runs this program, and they're asking for this piece of money. Now we haven't found out if this is like an extra piece above and beyond some other grant, or we don't

have any of that information yet. Our source at Planning and Development, really that's the best explanation we can give at this point, so what the outcomes are or any of that stuff, we don't have any of that stuff yet.

MS. WENDLER: Thank you.

MR. GULOCK: I'm turning to page 26.

MR. SIMONS: Susan has a question before that.

MS. GLASER: Thank you, I just have a quick question. Do you think maybe there's an error? I mean I'm just thinking that a drug abuse program seems more fitting for the Health Department.

MS. FERRIS: I wondered that myself. Human Services does the homeless programs, and whether it's tied -- it's marked, it was in the category as a homeless program so they --

MS. GLASER: Right. But, I mean it's moving from there to Planning and Development.

MS. FERRIS: Right, except the department is being phased out.

MS. GLASER: What department?

MS. FERRIS: Human Services.

MS. GLASER: Right, okay. But, I mean, maybe they meant it as a form of health, why would you send that to Planning and Development?

MS. FERRIS: Homeless is all going into Planning and Development.

MS. GLASER: Oh, they -- oh.

MS. FERRIS: That's what I understand. Because, you know, it's an attempt to knit the Block Grant management people back together instead of having them spread out into two different departments.

MS. GLASER: Thank you.

MR. GULOCK: Turning to page 26, there's nothing new here from last week that I'm aware of. And on page 27, the only new item is the Virginia Park redevelopment area, which Mr.

Glenn has alluded to, and the Mayor is asking for 810,000. We just found a little bit of information on the project today, that we understand the Virginia Park Citizen District Council supports it; it's for new housing, I think west of the Lodge, north of Henry Ford Hospital. Part of it is marked, 20% is for low-mod, but it's a new construction housing project the Planning Department is proposing, that they support.

MS. WENDLER: Affordable? Is it affordable?

MR. GULOCK: We understand 20 -- 20% of the units will be affordable.

MS. WENDLER: So this is a gap financing; is this money for gap financing?

MS. BRUHN: No, it's public improvement.

DR. CASON: This is in-fill housing?

MR. GULOCK: This is for public improvements.

MS. WENDLER: Okay.

MR. GULOCK: To support the housing project.

DR. CASON: This is in-fill?

MR. LOPER: Yes. I mean, it's in-fill in the sense that there's basically a block on Philadelphia that's basically vacant, that is to be developed, and also along the Lodge Freeway.

MR. SIMONS: They want to build houses, new houses there?

MR. LOPER: Yeah, this thing apparently on Philadelphia and also on the freeway, Lodge Freeway Service Drive and on Byron.

DR. CASON: But it's quite a fairly new project just south of there, and it goes over -- it's Virginia Park right there. Well, I guess Virginia Park itself.

MR. SIMONS: Talking about Delaware.

DR. CASON: It's near Ford Hospital.

MR. SIMONS: Right.

DR. CASON: Just west of Ford Hospital, some new development in there, over to Rosa Park Boulevard.

MR. LOPER: Virginia Park Estates?

DR. CASON: Yes.

MS. BRUHN: You're talking about the single-family housing?

DR. CASON: That's right.

MS. BRUHN: That's probably what, eight or nine, ten years --

DR. CASON: So this would be north of that?

MR. LOPER: A little north, or northeast of that.

DR. CASON: Okay.

MR. SIMONS: Okay, Chris?

MR. GULOCK: And the next section gets into the repavement. As we said before, we had numbers in here last week, but the Mayor is not committing any numbers to the repavement. He feels he can reprogram some unused Block Grant money for these repavements, and he has not included any money for the demolition float. So we decided to agree with him, to commit our money to other -- commit it to other projects.

DR. CASON: Is that project a done deal? I remember that came before us, that pharmaceutical. Did they do that?

MS. BRUHN: Oh, the expansion --

DR. CASON: Yeah.

MS. BRUHN: -- for Port Huron Home?

DR. CASON: Yeah.

MS. BRUHN: I don't know if it's been completed. Has it been done?

MR. LOPER: Yeah. As a matter of fact, they're going to come back for a further expansion.

MR. GULOCK: I'm not sure if you want to stop there and make any changes on what we just covered on repayments, or go to the

end. I mean the rest is pretty much staffing. We've -- we've put in, I think we've generally put in the numbers that the Mayor requested for staffing minus, well, the 20% cap.

MS. WENDLER: Has BSE demolition staff always been in the Block Grant budget?

MR. GULOCK: Well, it's funded on Block Grant, but the staff is under Building Department.

MS. WENDLER: And always has been?

MR. GULOCK: Well, yeah. It used to be under DPW but then it just merged, it's all folded into the Building Department in the last three years, I think.

MS. WENDLER: But it's always come out of the Block Grant budget is what you're saying, okay.

MR. GULOCK: Correct.

MR. GLENN: I have a question.

MR. SIMONS: Mm-hmm, go ahead.

MR. GLENN: On 25, where they have the Mayor requesting --

MS. FERRIS: For which group?

MR. GLENN: Pardon?

MS. FERRIS: For which group are we on?

MR. GLENN: Lead abatement.

MR. SIMONS: Page 25?

MR. GLENN: 750-, that's on 25.

MS. FERRIS: I'm not sure I understand the question.

MR. GLENN: Is he asking for \$750,000 for lead abatement --

MS. FERRIS: Yes.

MR. GLENN: -- in the houses?

MS. FERRIS: Yes.



MR. GLENN: And then --

MS. FERRIS: These are, I believe, for houses with children, who have children, who are lead-poisoned, the recommendation from the staff was that that be 0, because they have just gotten a large grant.

MR. GLENN: That's it. You answered my question.

MR. SIMONS: Okay.

MR. GULOCK: On staffing, in general, the Mayor has asked for reductions in all the PDD staff, line items from last year, and I think they do have a number of vacancies at Planning and Development, that they plan to terminate or reduce -- not fill the vacancies. That's pretty much the changes since last week. I mean, it's a guess but --

MR. SIMONS: Now we're going to find out if we can find money.

MS. ALCOCK: That's right, \$220,128.

MR. SIMONS: Can we find it?

MS. ALCOCK: Anything is fair game, so it's really up to this body to decide where they'd like to see some reduction in order to bring this into balance.

MR. SIMONS: Okay. Anybody have any ideas?

MR. JEFFREY: Well, I identified at least three groups that I'd like to see them -- one is Brush Park redevelopment. Because if we're asking groups to -- you know, if a group came for money and you saw that they -- they had money that they had not spent, you'd tell them -- so I'm recommending we take some of it from there, I'm not sure how much.

MS. GLASER: Which page are we going to?

MR. JEFFREY: Page 23. And we take the difference from the far east side, I'd say half and half. That's my suggestion.

MS. BRUHN: That would be 110,000 --

MR. JEFFREY: Yeah.

MS. BRUHN: -- from each group.

MR. SIMONS: Far east side -- what page are we on? I lost it; I had it.

MR. JEFFREY: Far east side is on --

MR. CHRISTENSEN: 24.

MR. SIMONS: Page 24. Okay, good, so we take out of those two groups, Heidi, and take from those two.

MS. ALCOCK: So 110- and some change on each one.

MR. SIMONS: Alright, take an aspirin.

DR. CASON: I think we need more than an aspirin. J.D. might be more appropriate.

MR. SIMONS: Okay.

DR. CASON: We want to know where J.D. is.

MR. SIMONS: Okay.

MR. JEFFREY: The last point is -- and I understood that there are no vacancies in the staff, right? They eliminated --

MS. GLASER: There is P&DD.

MR. JEFFREY: No, I'm talking about in the --

MS. GLASER: P&DD.

MR. JEFFREY: P&DD staff, I understood that they eliminated all the vacancies.

MR. SIMONS: Eliminated the vacancies, cut out --

MR. JEFFREY: That's what I heard.

MR. GULOCK: Well, the response they gave us right now is that for -- for last year -- no, let's see, for this fiscal year there is 267- budgeted, I think that's total.

MR. JEFFREY: I'm mainly talking about public service.

MR. GULOCK: Oh.

MS. FERRIS: Actually, the public service, if I remember -- might be different in his answer -- but what we understood

from the Mayor's budget is that there was, I think, 18, and they have added three, because they have shifted all the Economic Development contracts into that group so that department, that section is funded for 21 positions now.

MR. JEFFREY: And that all fits, there's no --

MS. FERRIS: That I don't know, because that's in this information we got today, and I haven't looked at it yet.

MS. WENDLER: Mr. Chair?

MR. SIMONS: Oh, sure.

MS. WENDLER: Maybe through the Chair to the staff, do we have any -- did we get any data on retirement to Planning and Development; are they projecting, giving us any projections?

MR. GULOCK: We haven't received anything in writing. We have heard, you know, through the grapevine that several staff are going to be retiring.

MS. WENDLER: I'm often at that building and it seems as if there are a number of retirements.

MR. SIMONS: Okay. Are we ready to vote now? You got everything in place that you want? Any other comments from the staff or from the Commissioners?

MR. JEFFREY: You know, eventually this -- this whole idea of staff versus community has kind of caught up with us. Now there's not any liberal -- you either -- especially as it relates to public service, you either take public service and give it to community groups or you fund staff.

MS. FERRIS: Actually, right now, the way the Mayor's budget is presented, there is no staff dollars labeled as public service, they're probably all in this admin., am I right? There is some -- there is some PA money that's going to help groups with passing building, etcetera, like 400,000, but the rest of it labeled is admin., so they have not usurped any public service dollars --

MR. JEFFREY: Okay, so all the public service dollars that accounted for the cap are not staff.

MS. FERRIS: They're going to groups, with the exception --

MR. JEFFREY: They're going to groups.

MS. FERRIS: -- of that 80,000 that's going to the department for that one program.

MR. JEFFREY: Okay, that's good.

MS. FERRIS: And I believe it's true to say, your recommendations here, the recommendations before you, have a little bit of admin. money in groups, is that correct still?

MS. ALCOCK: Yeah, they're actually in the Block Grant chart. There's two that I can think of off the top of my head, but correct me if I'm wrong. There's two groups that are just getting started, but they're very organized and they're ready to get their plan in place, and we felt it was very important, we didn't -- we couldn't afford to send them at a very high level, but we felt it was very important, based on the Commission's priorities, that startup groups are able to begin that endeavor so that eventually, for senior houses in those neighborhoods, too. So that was something that was different from the Mayor's budget.

MR. SIMONS: Okay.

MS. BRUHN: I had to step out for a while, while the staff was discussing the recommendations, and I know one of the things that was on the table was to do with shelters for domestic violence, victims of domestic violence. That's not in here, is it?

MS. FERRIS: No, that's not. That was on the letter that we presented or sent yesterday with the packet, that the Commission may want to consider that, but it's not actually worked into the chart.

MS. BRUHN: Right, okay.

MS. FERRIS: The two of the shelter -- the domestic violence shelters, both of them were ineligible, and in an attempt to figure out some strategy to fund them, which, you know, Council talked about last year and then ultimately just violated the criteria, if you will, and funded them, but we were suggesting you may want to think about an alternative way by estab -- establish -- establishing a line item at this level, as opposed until waiting until it gets to Council, and that's entirely within your purview. But it

will create another public service problem.

MR. JEFFREY: What was the -- can I ask, what was the violation, I guess?

MS. TILLMAN: For this year?

MR. JEFFREY: I mean, they weren't funded because of?

MS. WENDLER: Inadequate applications.

MR. JEFFREY: Something was wrong with the application. Was it --

MS. TILLMAN: For -- Mr. Chair?

MR. SIMONS: Mm-hmm.

MS. TILLMAN: For Women's Justice Center, the budget did not reflect the total amount requested. There was a summary -- they didn't give the summary of the description of the program, and they had an outdated financial statement which was included, but it was from 2002. For interim house, YWCA, there was no answer to question, PS question number 43 and 44, basically asked the income in the residency, how do you actually get that information. Now this one is a little more cloudy because they did answer question number 6, that directly related to question PS 43 and PS 44.

MS. BRUHN: Well, I just -- I just wanted to raise it --

MR. SIMONS: Sure.

MS. BRUHN: -- in terms of the letter. But obviously it would be cleaner to just leave things the way they are, and to sit down with --

MS. WENDLER: Exactly.

MS. BRUHN: So that there is consistency all through the Commission's recommendations.

MS. WENDLER: Yeah. I would feel very uncomfortable given the City, the conversation we had.

MR. SIMONS: So now, if someone could make a motion to vote on NOF first.

MR. JEFFREY: Move to adopt recommendations with the changes, CRC's recommendation with the changes made on the documents.

MS. GLASER: Support.

MR. SIMONS: CRC or CPC?

MR. JEFFREY: CPC recommendations.

MR. SIMONS: CPC recommendations, okay.

MS. GLASER: Support it.

MR. GLENN: That's, you're going to --

MR. JEFFREY: That earlier, what we did to that.

MR. GLENN: Okay, that's good, yes.

MR. SIMONS: Second the motion?

MR. GLENN: Second the motion.

DR. CASON: Susan had second -- didn't you second, Susan?

MS. GLASER: Right.

MR. GLENN: You got two seconds.

MR. SIMONS: Now we move to accept the CPC staff recommendation, whether the changes we're making or not, are we ready to vote? All in favor, the motion to support, say aye.

ALL: Aye.

MR. SIMONS: Opposing, abstentions.

(No verbal response)

MR. SIMONS: Motion is passed.

MS. BRUHN: And just for clarification, Mr. Chair, that was the CRC recommendation?

MR. SIMONS: Right.

MS. WENDLER: Mr. Chair?

MR. SIMONS: Yeah.

MS. WENDLER: One piece of good news.  
Good news, we need it.

MR. SIMONS:

MS. WENDLER: I think people will appreciate -- in the West Village neighborhood, we did have a massage parlor sign in one of the houses, in the neighborhood, and Ava Paylor (ph), who's the director of (inaudible) Neighborhood City Hall, did send an inspector, and we may still have a massage parlor, but we're no longer advertising.

DR. CASON: And they're real massages?

MS. WENDLER: They're real massages. So things do get taken care of, I think.

DR. CASON: Real massages.

MS. WENDLER: All I know is they don't advertise it any more.

MR. JEFFREY: We just voted on --

MS. BRUHN: NOF.

MR. JEFFREY: Right. I wanted to say CRC, but that included --

MS. BRUHN: No, that was, the motion was to approve CRC's recommendations with the changes made by the Commission.

MR. SIMONS: Yeah, right. Okay, now we're ready for Block Grant.

MR. JEFFREY: Now we got to do Block Grant. Move approval for Block Grant.

DR. CASON: Support.

MR. SIMONS: Move, support, that we approve Block Grant with the changes made?

MR. JEFFREY: With the changes made.

MR. SIMONS: Okay. All those in favor of the motion, vote it, say aye?

ALL: Aye.

MR. SIMONS: Oppose it, abstentions?

(No verbal response)

MR. SIMONS: The motion carries. Give a hand.

MS. BRUHN: Mr. Chair, I just want to --

MR. SIMONS: Yeah, go ahead.

MS. BRUHN: I just want to mention to the staff, before everybody leaves, I am going to give the Commission Members a quick update on what happened at the Housing Strategy presentation. So if some of you are able to stay around in case there are any questions, I'd appreciate it. If you don't have it -- I did summarize some of the comments on the Director's Report, but you don't have it --

MR. SIMONS: Nobody wanted to stay.

MS. BRUHN: That's okay.

MR. GLENN: Are you going to do it now?

MR. SIMONS: Yeah, right now.

MR. GLENN: Okay, because I'm getting ready to leave.

MR. SIMONS: Okay, go ahead. The Director's Report?

MS. BRUHN: Well, Dr. Cason had something he wanted to bring up.

DR. CASON: This is in regard to our procedure of doing those conceptual diagrams, you know, we talked about, and I'd just like to clarify this, but do you want to do it before you talk about what you just were going to --

MS. BRUHN: Well, if we -- if we do the Director's Report first, then they can all leave, and they've had a very long day, if that's alright with you.

MR. SIMONS: Fine, go ahead.

MS. BRUHN: Okay. Well, I'll just run through this quickly; you should have a written report. Council did approve the Hubbard-Richard Rehabilitation Project Development Plan amendment as recommended by the Commission, so we're very pleased with that. You did ask when the Commission's budget would be before Council. At this moment it -- the Council is scheduled to discuss the budget on Monday morning at



10:00 -- I'm sorry, at 9:30 -- at 9:30. The Block Grant is supposed to start at 10. So, you know, if anyone wants to come, you're welcome to. They are going to go through the division budgets very carefully, but they have already approved the 10% pay-cut, as you know, for non-union employees, including contractals.

And then the third item is just a quick summary, in the middle of everything we're doing today, about the Housing Strategy that was presented to the Council on Monday, April 11th, so that was -- it's hard to believe that was this week, right?

It seems like a year ago. But, and there was -- appreciation was expressed for the Commission's efforts; however, there were a number of comments about the Housing Strategy and some additional points, or let's say expectations that the Council Members had. They are planning to continue this discussion sometime next week, although I don't know when that's scheduled, but just to run through this, Alberta Tinsley-Talabi posed her questions right away, because she was -- she was hoping that we would be addressing, that the Commission would be addressing the type of housing that we ought to be looking for, based on the needs that were identified; the number of units that are needed to address the shortage; and then, especially, where they should be located. She thought that we would be coming in and saying, "Well, here, there should be new housing in this area, it should be this type, and it should be for this, you know, population," so that's obviously a challenge to do. I think that, you know, we did stress that this is -- this is a policy framework and they're going to have to go through and they really need to prioritize and then we need to talk about, okay, if we want to implement these things, what has to be done. They want us to look at the Land Trust in Camden, New Jersey, as an example of how to route housing to low and moderate income families, so we'll be looking at that. There's a lot of concern about speculators, people who hold the property and don't repair it, and they thought that we ought to be looking at taking away people's right to property if they don't repair it within a certain period.

MR. SIMONS: Say it one more time.

MS. BRUHN: They would take away property owner's rights to their property.

MS. WENDLER: That would require enforcement.

MS. BRUHN: And that they would have to develop it within a certain period of time or it would revert to the city. They emphasized building home ownership. Let's see, addressing renters, I think they wanted more emphasis on renters. In the technical report they were going to file -- we gave them basically the presentation we gave to you and said that there would be a technical report that would be coming. Mr. Bates was particularly interested in ways in which to involve unemployed Detroiters in housing construction and programs that would do that, and cited an example of one group in Detroit that was doing that. They wanted to know more about incentives for housing development. They talked about, you know, home ownership counseling and not just how to maintain a house, but the financial literacy, both for existing as well as potential homeowners. Again, this kind of relates to involving unemployed persons, Mr. Bates has a particular interest in participation in housing construction by Detroiters, and particularly African-Americans, and he emphasized that.

Ms. Collins had some issues around homelessness. She felt that we needed to look at where more adult foster care facilities, how adult foster care people -- people who are in adult foster care, ex-felons, mental health, people with mental health problems, where do they fit in all of this, in the homelessness. She thought that there was -- that was a mission in the report. She also asked us to look at what constitutes a family, because she said family members -- you know, in the past there were multiple generations in one household, and now families are more isolated, so from a sociological perspective, it has an impact on housing in our neighborhoods.

And there was a comment, that we should be putting money in neighborhoods that have not been getting funding in the past, they cited some examples of neighborhoods, and not put it in certain neighborhoods, and it was mentioned, like Hubbard-Richard and Corktown.

And then, this is something that relates to other discussions they had about Brownfield, obsolete property, neighborhood Enterprise Zones, these kind of incentives that have been encouraging housing development, also commercial development, and they -- they feel that this should be -- I think, we should be helping in this, prioritizing the areas that ought to be getting these incentives so that the incent

-- you know, we try to encourage development. That Commissioner Glaser was talking about her neighborhood, you encourage development in certain neighborhoods.

So they've asked to have the Housing Strategy forwarded to the Planning and Development Department, and they would like us to work with Planning and Development, which we're also working with on a Housing Strategy, and see if we can bring the documents together, although we don't have a document from them, and they wanted the document referred to the Housing Task Force. Do you have any questions?

MR. SIMONS: No, I think I have a couple of questions and a couple of comments. I think knowing where the houses should go, in what neighborhoods they should be built up, it would be excellent if we took, along with Planning and Development, a tour one day, bus tour, go throughout the city and look, and look at what's happening and see, I think, what can be saved if you catch it before it dies, and I think that's what we need to do, is maintain what you have and build it up. If you go to neighborhoods where everything is down, then it's going to be hard to build from there. If you save our neighborhood, if you rebuild in-fill homes in the neighborhoods that have vacancies. Kathy?

MS. WENDLER: I think Council's comments were absolutely, you know, useful and to the point. I think they asked questions at a level of specificity that our plan didn't get into, but -- and I don't know what staff -- you know, how staff feels about going to that level, but it would be interesting to hear what your recommendation would be.

MS. BRUHN: We're -- we're still trying to find the time to really --

MR. SIMONS: I know, time.

MS. BRUHN: We did get some really nice comments from people in the audience, and community organizations who happened to be present, and heard some other staff. You know, it wasn't -- it was a hard subject, you know, as they can tell you, because you can just go so many different directions. You know, how do you get your arms around this?

MR. SIMONS: That's right.

DR. CASON: Mr. Chairman?

MR. SIMONS: Go ahead.

DR. CASON: One piece that we should be looking at very serious is identifying maintenance education. To just take a look and just buying a home, making a down payment, you got to be able to understand when you buy a home what are you in for: maintenance, maintaining that home, and things like HUD, people buy a home, don't even figure into that type of equation at all; maintenance is one of the things that you have to continue to work at. And I guess that's the reason why I chose Justice. We have an application, when a person moves in, this is what we expect for a person that moves in the neighborhood, and they don't fill this out because there is no enforcement here, and that's what we going to have to -- we can do all of these things and put them in place, but if there is no enforcement, they're not going to waste their time.

MR. SIMONS: Sure, I agree. Susan?

MS. GLASER: I would just like to mention, also, I think it was about six years ago, there was a major push by the Detroit unions to bring in Detroiters into the apprenticeship program, and I know that they were fairly successful, because some of the kids on the ball team, you know, came up in my backyard, actually were lucky enough to pass some of those tests. So, I mean, maybe the issue is that somebody should be working with the unions again. I know that there hasn't been a lot of that going on in the last several years.

MS. WENDLER: Apprenticeship programs.

MS. GLASER: Right, right, exactly, and the skilled trades programs. I mean, there's money there and, you know, it's a way to help our community. Once young men and young women start making good money, they can pay taxes.

MR. SIMONS: Have anything, comments that you would like to add?

MS. BRUHN: Thank you all for staying.

DR. CASON: Thank you so much. And those other people -- those other people's names are noted, the people that left.

MR. SIMONS: Oh, anything, any other --

MS. BRUHN: That's all I have, Mr. Chair.

MR. SIMONS: Go ahead.

DR. CASON: Last meeting, we had the concept of the -- what building was that, that building? Was that -- was it Morgan Estates, or was it another one?

MS. BRUHN: No, it wasn't Morgan, it was Brush Park.

DR. CASON: Oh, Brush Park.

MS. BRUHN: The parking development.

DR. CASON: And I had -- remember I had an objection, I said they had made a serious error and had omitted the dimensions.

MR. SIMONS: Dimensions of the rooms.

DR. CASON: And I was told that it was conceptual and that it was not necessary to have the dimensions. Well, to me, how can I make a decision on something, I don't know what size the rooms, the bathrooms, how many, the kitchen? But I also can understand the conceptual part. So if it's going to be conceptual, and we vote on it, do we get a chance to vote on it when it becomes a reality? How can we just vote on something that's conceptual and we never see it any more? No telling what goes on when they do the final planning. So how can we, or can we change the process?

MS. BRUHN: Well, we, particularly in Planned Development District, we have a set of guidelines that the developers have to follow as to what they need to submit, and one of those is that they need to submit dimensioned site plans. This is the second time Morgan Estates, the same issue, we did not get dimensioned site plans. The PD process does have -- the Planning and Development process can be done in one phase or two. It can -- plans can come in, conceptual plans can come in, which don't have all the dimensions, where everything isn't quite finalized, or maybe you don't know all the exterior material, and the Commission can approve a conceptual site plan -- a site plan, and actually elevations, and then have the developer come back with the final plan. In this case, with the Brush Park Project, and also with the Morgan Estates, they intended to come in and get your okay on -- when I say final, it's not what's ready to be submitted to the Building Department for a permit, but, you know, well-dimensioned plans, where you can really

see what is going to be developed, and where the sidewalks are, and how big the parking spaces are, you know, at that level. And, so when they said they were conceptual, then, if that's the case, then the Commission should give a conceptual approval and not a final approval.

DR. CASON: Because I can't --

MS. BRUHN: But we've talked to them, and we told them that they really need to submit the fully dimensioned plan, because I think that's really what they want.

DR. CASON: And I had a little -- with Mr. Gulock, with Chris, had a little run-in, this incident done before, but I asked the same thing about the Ferry Street. No dimensions on Ferry Street, and I asked the same question. I mean, in my long career, some point along the line I had drafting, and I know there is no way for me to do a conceptual plan without some sort of dimensions.

MS. BRUHN: Although I will have to say on something like -- on something like that, I don't know that we have always asked for all of the room sizes for, say, single-family. Those weren't single-family, they were town houses. No, I think usually we have had plans that show room sizes, I would say that, so that we can get an idea of -- of what we're going to get, what kind of product we need to get.

DR. CASON: That's what I'm thinking. I think I have the right to --

MR. SIMONS: Should know how many square feet. That would give you an idea of how --

MS. BRUHN: Because they have the square footage, so you know they must have --

DR. CASON: How in the world can a draftsman draw a floor plan without some kind of dimensions? They may be -- I don't know how they did it, but the only thing I'm saying, if it's procedure, then I would go along with it, but I can't vote on anything that I don't know -- you know, it has to be more realistic.

MS. BRUHN: We just have to be more careful in terms of what they're giving us.

MR. SIMONS: That's right, I agree.

DR. CASON: So what are we going to do? We're going to ask for dimensions?

MS. BRUHN: We're going to stick -- we're going to stick with our guidelines.

DR. CASON: Which includes the dimensions?

MS. BRUHN: Which includes the dimensions. And Morgan Estates is coming back with dimensions. I think they have already submitted them, and we have asked for them for Brush Park.

MR. SIMONS: Okay. Susan?

MS. GLASER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So you're still -- you're still completing the work on Morgan Estates, that's not through yet?

MS. BRUHN: Yes. I think it's going to come back on the 21st.

MS. GLASER: Okay.

MS. BRUHN: We're trying for that.

MS. GLASER: And then -- I'm sorry.

MS. BRUHN: No, I think we have most of -- I think we have most of the questions answered.

MS. GLASER: And then my second question was, the report was passed out on a number of demolition --

MS. BRUHN: Yes.

MS. GLASER: -- permits by the City and by the cluster, and I guess I wasn't clear, that's my fault, I guess I would like to know by year how it came down; this goes all the way back to 1995.

MS. BRUHN: Okay, so you would like this one broken out by year?

MS. GLASER: I'd like this one broken out by year.

MS. BRUHN: Oh, this one.

MS. GLASER: Right.

MS. BRUHN: Oh, okay.

MS. GLASER: Because I'm just wondering if -- because I'm hearing from people that 28 months was a good time period for us to get out there, and I'm thinking if that's a good time period, what is the rest of the city --

MR. SIMONS: I wouldn't be surprised.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: You know what, I'm sure they feel neglected on the west side of the city.

DR. CASON: But these are indicators to do -- you have some real trouble in your plan, that's indicated.

MS. GLASER: I know. I know, because I'm telling you, I was just thinking about it. But the good part, let me tell you one good part for sure, one of my neighbors has a rooster, and he comes to the driveway every morning and wakes me up, I love it.

DR. CASON: But isn't that against the law, to have a rooster in --

MS. GLASER: I don't care. I don't care, I love it. I haven't got into that. It's a nice sound to me, it's music to my ears.

DR. CASON: I'm not against roosters, but I just thought it was against the law.

MS. GLASER: I believe it is; I still like it.

DR. CASON: We've to have roosters.

MR. SIMONS: Anything else? The meeting is adjourned.

(WHEREUPON, the meeting was adjourned at 7:23 p.m.)

\* \* \* \* \*



STATE OF MICHIGAN) ) ss  
COUNTY OF OAKLAND)

I certify that this transcript is a complete, true, and correct record of the testimony held in the Special Meeting for the City Planning Commission, on April 14, 2005.

EDNA ZAID, CER 3934  
Certified Electronic Recorder  
Regency Court Reporting  
3133 Union Lake Road, Suite A  
Commerce Township, MI 48382  
(248) 360-2145